Hadiyyat al-Shīʿah

(A gift for the Shīʿah)

Part 2

Ḥujjat al-Islam Moulānā Muḥammad Qāsim Nānotwī

WWW.MAHAJJAH.COM

Contents

Transliteration key

أ إ - ’	ض - ḍ
آ - ā	ط - ṭ
ب - b	ظ - ẓ
ت - t	ع - ‘
ث - th	غ - gh
ج - j	ف - f
ح - ḥ	ق - q
خ - kh	ك - k
د - d	ل - l
ذ - dh	م - m
ر - r	ن - n
ز - z	و - w, ū
س - s	ه - h
ش - sh	ي - y, ī
ص - ṣ	

ʿAmmār ʿAlī's letter

Respected Mīr ṣāḥib

I have received your letter and read its contents. You have stated that you are not convinced about the Shīʿī stance pertaining to the estate of Fadak being oppressively withheld from Sayyidah Fāṭimah al-Zahrā' رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا. The actual reason for your misgivings is that you have not come into contact with a proficient scholar as yet. If you were to have met me and heard the accurate explanation from me, you would have realised that the Ahl al-Sunnah are in grave error, holding on to the wrong view and deceiving people about the actual state of affairs.

As for the three issues which you have referred to on behalf of ʿAbd al-Ḥaqq, the summary of this is as follows:

Firstly, the issue regarding the marriage of the Prophet's صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ daughters; this question is irrelevant because Sayyidah Fāṭimah al-Zahrā' رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا was the only daughter of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, and she was wed to ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. As for the remaining two daughters whom the Ahl al-Sunnah ascribe to the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, they were actually the daughters of Khadījah's رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا previous husband. Their names are Ruqayyah and Umm Kulthūm. Ibn Ḥajar, who is a muḥaddith of the Ahl al-Sunnah, records in *al-Iṣābah* that one of these two were married to ʿUtbah, the son of Abū Lahab, and the other was married to Abū al-ʿĀṣ ibn al-Rabīʿ, and both these men were disbelievers. They then married ʿUthmān. However, despite Islam gaining authority and dominance they remained in wedlock to disbelievers and the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ did not even bother to terminate their relationships with these disbelievers, so what if they were wed to ʿUthmān thereafter?

As for ʿUthmān, he was a believer and far better than those disbelievers whom they were initially attached to. However, ʿUthmān is responsible for such innovations after the demise of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ that ʿĀ'ishah said the following regarding him:

أقتلوا نعثلا ، لعن الله نعثلا ، أقتلوا حراق المصاحف

> Kill this long-bearded one! Curse be upon the long-bearded one! Kill the one who has burnt the copies of the Qur'ān.

His innovations reached such proportions that it compelled the Ṣaḥābah to murder him. These reports are accurately recorded in the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah and if you require a reference for them, I will despatch it to you.

Nevertheless, even if we were to assume that these two were the daughters of the Prophet ﷺ, then we would certainly have some reports highlighting their merit just as how the merit of Sayyidah Fāṭimah al-Zahrā' رضي الله عنها is recorded in the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah, as well as in the books of the Shīʿah. Consider the following in regard to Sayyidah Fāṭimah al-Zahrā' رضي الله عنها:

سيدة نساء العالمين

Queen of the women of the universe.

سيدة نساء أهل الجنة

Queen of the women of Jannah.

الفاطمة بضعة مني

Fāṭimah is a portion of me.

If these two were indeed the daughters of the Prophet ﷺ, there certainly would have been reports about their status and significance, but this is not the case.

As for the second issue, you have stated that ʿAlī رضي الله عنه fought many battles against ʿĀ'ishah, therefore if the three companions Abū Bakr, ʿUmar and ʿUthmān usurped the Fadak Estate, why did ʿAlī رضي الله عنه not wage jihād against them? This issue is also incorrect because ʿAlī رضي الله عنه did not fight many battles with ʿĀ'ishah. He only fought one battle in which he was victorious and this is also recorded in the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah. As for usurping the Fadak Estate, this does not necessitate jihād since jihād is a holy war; not a war for wealth and worldly possessions. Therefore, the Ambiyā' and the Imāms only wage jihād for the upliftment of dīn, not for worldly pursuits.

Similarly, when did ʿAlī رضي الله عنه ever have supporters with whom he could have waged jihād? Consequently, jihād is only mandatory when one has a reasonable group of supporters. This is why jihād was not ordained upon the Prophet ﷺ in the Makkan period. When he migrated from Makkah on account of fear of the disbelievers and relocated to Madīnah, he waged war with the help of the Anṣār. However, as long as he remained in Makkah, he was overwhelmed even though he had a handful of supporters. ʿAlī رضي الله عنه was one of these faithful supporters but he was also helpless. Ultimately, they all left Makkah in fear. ʿAlī رضي الله عنه faced similar circumstances during the reign of the three Khulafā' and he was unable to wage jihād. However, when he had considerable support, he waged war against ʿĀ'ishah and against Muʿāwiyah.

As for the third issue, it relates to the marriage of ʿAlī's رضي الله عنه daughters. The answer to this is that ʿAlī رضي الله عنه had two daughters from his marriage to Sayyidah Fāṭimah al-Zahrā' رضي الله عنها. Zaynab, the elder of the two, who was married to ʿAbd Allāh ibn Jaʿfar al-Ṭayyār and the younger, Umm Kulthūm, who was married to Muḥammad ibn Jaʿfar al-Ṭayyār. This is briefly the answer to your question, and had you requested more details on the issue, it would have been dispatched.

As for the issue of Fadak, it demands a lengthy response but I would suffice with a summary of it. If you are fair and unbiased then this will suffice. Similarly, this response is in accordance with that which is recorded in the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah; anyone who doubts this is free to check this response against their original references and then determine whether they are guilty of oppression or not.

Consequently, Jalāl al-dīn al-Suyūṭī (in *al-Durr al-Manthūr*), ʿAlī Muttaqī (in *Kanz al-ʿUmmāl*), Abū Yaʿlā Mawṣilī and the author of *Madārij al-Nubuwwah* and many other scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah state that when the following verse was revealed, the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم asked Jibrīl عليه السلام, who the "Dhū al-Qurbā" refers to and what was their right:

وآت ذا القربي حقه

Upon which Jibrīl عليه السلام said that the "Dhū al-Qurbā" refers to Fāṭimah, and that Fadak was her right. Consequently, the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم assigned Fadak to Fāṭimah. The reports which these scholars record establishes that the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم gave Fadak to Fāṭimah and that it belonged solely to her.

When the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم left this world and Abū Bakr succeeded him, he took Fadak away forcefully and deprived her of any rights to it. Is this not usurpation? Consider the following, Tārīkh al-ʿAbbās, which is a credible Sunnī reference states that when the progeny of Ḥasan and Ḥusayn claimed the Fadak estate from the Khalīfah Ma'mūn al-Rashīd, he gathered two hundred scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah and instructed them to explain the true nature of affairs regarding Fadak. These scholars transmitted on the authority of Wāqidī and Bashīr ibn Walīd that the afore-mentioned verse was revealed after the Conquest of Khaybar, and the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم asked Jibrīl عليه السلام who was referred to by the term "Dhū al-Qurbā" and what were their rights. Jibrīl عليه السلام informed him that Fāṭimah was his closest relative and Fadak was her sole right. The Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم then gave Fadak to her, which Abū Bakr snatched away when he became the khalīfah. When Fāṭimah

رضي الله عنها disputed this matter and claimed what was rightfully her inheritance, Abū Bakr apologized and intended to write a document restoring her rights upon it. Upon this, ʿUmar said that Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها should be asked to present witnesses who could testify that the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم had given Fadak to her. Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها then presented ʿAlī رضي الله عنه, Umm Ayman رضي الله عنها, who was a righteous woman, as well as Ḥasan رضي الله عنه, and Ḥusayn رضي الله عنه as witnesses and they testified in her favour. Abū Bakr then wrote out the document and restored it to her but ʿUmar snatched the document and tore it to pieces. He objected that since ʿAlī رضي الله عنه was Fāṭimah's رضي الله عنها husband, his testimony in her favour was not valid. Abū Bakr agreed with this view.

This incident of Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها asking for Fadak and presenting ʿAlī رضي الله عنه, Umm Ayman رضي الله عنها and her two sons as witnesses, and Abū Bakr's ultimate rejection is recorded in many books of the Ahl al-Sunnah, such as *Ṣawāʿiq al-Muḥriqah*, *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb*, *Muʿjam al-Buldān*, *Riyāḍ al-Naḍirah*, *Kanz al-ʿUmmāl*, the *Tārīkh* of al-Ḥākim, *Jamʿ al-Jawāmiʿ*, *Sharḥ Mawāqif*, *Nihāyah al-ʿUqūl* and many other books.

Therefore, Abū Bakr considered Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها and her witnesses as liars. However, when others made claims, he accepted their word without asking them to present witnesses and handed over what they were claiming.

Consequently, *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* reports that Jābir went to Abū Bakr and told him that the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم had promised him a considerable sum of money from the revenue of Bahrain but he departed from this world before it came. Jābir said that since the revenue of Bahrain had arrived in the era of Abū Bakr, he now asks him to honour the promise of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم. Jābir relates that Abū Bakr gave him three handfuls of wealth without asking him to produce any witness to the words of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم.

Fatḥ al-Bārī, which is a commentary of *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, records the reason for Abū Bakr giving the wealth without asking for any testimony. It states that Abū Bakr felt that it was impossible for a Ṣaḥābī such as Jābir to make a false claim against the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم. If Jābir was a doubtful character, then who could ever be considered truthful thereafter? Therefore, Abū Bakr did not ask him to produce any witness.

I say, how absurd is the religiosity of the Ahl al-Sunnah! They have no regard for Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها, who is the apple of the Prophet's صلى الله عليه وسلم eye, yet they have such high regard for a lowly companion like Jābir. They consider Jābir credible and refrain from branding him a liar whilst Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها is not

and she is compelled to present witnesses who are then dishonoured and discredited. They say that ʿAlī رضي الله عنه is the husband and his testimony may have a motive. Therefore, they consider ʿAlī رضي الله عنه to be a liar whereas he too is a Ṣaḥābī, but unfortunately, he is less than Jābir. As for Hasan رضي الله عنه and Ḥusayn رضي الله عنه, they are her sons and their testimony may also have a motive. This leaves Umm Ayman all alone and the testimony of a single woman falls short of the minimum requirement.

Now you decide whether this is injustice and oppression or not? If this is not usurpation, then what is? Similarly, is this classified as hatred for the Ahl al-Bayt or love? Is this what the rights of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم demand? The truth of the matter is that the Ahl al-Sunnah have such enmity for the Ahl al-Bayt that it makes them overlook the rights of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم.

You have stated that you were not convinced about the Shīʿah stance of Fadak being oppressively withheld from Fatimah رضي الله عنها. Now, I ask you to record the response of the Ahl al-Sunnah in the light of what I have written. Ask them why Jābir was considered truthful and Sayyidah Fāṭimah al-Zahrā' رضي الله عنها was not credible despite her presenting witnesses. Similarly, when she realised that Abū Bakr had considered her claim false and she asked for it to be given to her as inheritance instead then Abū Bakr fabricated a ḥadīth which is in conflict with the Noble Qur'ān itself. He said that he heard the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم saying that the material possessions of the Ambiyā' should be disposed of as charity and none of it would be for their heirs. In addition to this narration contradicting the Qur'ān, the Prophet of Allah neither informed his daughter or any of his wives that his wealth would be disposed of in charity and they would have nothing of it, so they should not lay claims to it. How could the Messenger of Allah conceal this divine injunction from those concerned and reveal it to a stranger who has no one else to verify this report.

Despite all of this, Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها once again came to Abū Bakr whilst he was on the pulpit and said to him: "How strange is it that your daughter will have a share of your inheritance but I have no share of my fathers' wealth?" Upon this, Abū Bakr descended from the pulpit and wrote the document restoring her ownership. However, ʿUmar came along and enquired about the document once again. He tore the document and disputed Abū Bakr's decision. He said that they were preoccupied with wars against the Arabs and this was no time for such an issue. Ṣibt ibn al-Jawzī records this narration in his *Sīrah*.

Wāqidī, who is a muḥaddith of the Ahl al-Sunnah, as well as Burhān al-Dīn al-Ḥalbī state in their reports that Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها came to Abū Bakr and laid a claim to Fadak saying that her father had given it to her. Abū Bakr wrote a document handing Fadak over to her. As she was on her way back, she came upon ʿUmar and he enquired about the document she had with her. ʿUmar then snatched the document and tore it to pieces.

If someone were to say that Abū Bakr is surely not at fault since he had written the document then we would say that being the khalīfah, he was not subjected to ʿUmar in any way and he should have opposed him and reprimanded him. However, he agreed with ʿUmar and never took any decision without consulting ʿUmar first.

Similarly, if ʿAlī رضي الله عنه and the rest of the Ṣaḥābah believed the fabricated narration of Abū Bakr regarding the inheritance of the Ambiyā' then why did ʿAlī رضي الله عنه and ʿAbbās رضي الله عنه raise this issue once again with ʿUmar during his reign as the khalīfah? On that occasion, ʿUmar told them that they considered Abū Bakr to be a liar, a cheat, a deceiver and a transgressor and they harboured the very same thoughts about him, but he would do nothing more than what Abū Bakr had done about the matter. This narration is recorded in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Muslim*.

The *Musnad* of Aḥmad records that this matter was raised once again with ʿUthmān during his reign. Therefore, if Abū Bakr was truthful, they would never have claimed Fadak from him. This establishes that Abū Bakr forged the narration and he usurped Fadak from Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها due to his hatred for the Ahl al-Bayt. Similarly, ʿUmar highlighted to ʿAlī رضي الله عنه and Abbās رضي الله عنه that they considered Abū Bakr to be a fraud and a liar and they have the same sentiments for him. So, when ʿAlī رضي الله عنه considers them to be liars and cheats, then we will do the same. This is the true narrative regarding the Fadak Estate.

Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī adds that when Abū Bakr refused to hand over Fadak then Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها became angry and refused to speak to him ever again. Similarly, *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Muslim* records that when she was leaving this world, Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها made a bequest that Abū Bakr and ʿUmar should not attend her funeral ceremony.

Response to the letter

The above is a word-for-word reproduction of ʿAmmār ʿAlī's letter. Now be prepared to deliberate on our response so that the reality of his letter may be exposed and the prudence and insight of Shīʿī scholars may be uncovered. Whilst it seems to contain lengthy allegations and criticism, it is void of substance. It contains three or four objections which are essentially invalid. If you do not believe this, then let us assess them.

Firstly, ʿAmmār ʿAlī says that Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها was the only daughter of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم. As for the two daughters, whom the Ahl al-Sunnah ascribe to the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم, they are not his biological daughters. Instead, they were the daughters of Khadījah رضي الله عنها from her previous husband.

It is rather pleasing that ʿAmmār ʿAlī attributes them to Khadījah رضي الله عنها. We are grateful for this degree of injustice too, because just as he has disassociated them from the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم, some of these enemies of the Ahl al-Bayt actually sever their link from Khadījah رضي الله عنها as well.

Nevertheless, ʿAmmār ʿAlī has stooped to the lowest levels of shamelessness by asserting that Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها was the only daughter of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم. His opposition to the Ahl al-Sunnah has resulted in the loss of his īmān, let alone the injustice committed against the sacred household of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم. In adopting this stance, he disregards the Noble Qur'ān and his own authentic books as well.

Four Daughters of the Prophet ﷺ

The Qur'ān attests to the Prophet ﷺ having multiple daughters

Those who have any sense of justice should consider my words and feel free to object if they find any cause for concern. Consequently, the Noble Qur'ān establishes that the Prophet ﷺ had many daughters, but if the Shīʿah are unaware by this because of their inability to retain the Qur'ān to memory then we would cite the verse for their convenience:

يَا أَيُّهَا النَّبِيُّ قُلْ لِّأَزْوَاجِكَ وَبَنَاتِكَ وَنِسَاءِ الْمُؤْمِنِيْنَ يُدْنِيْنَ عَلَيْهِنَّ مِنْ جَلَابِيْبِهِنَّ

O Prophet, tell your wives and your daughters and the women of the believers to bring down over themselves [part] of their outer garments.[1]

Now it is not too difficult for ʿAmmār ʿAlī to understand that the word *Banāt* (daughters) appears in plural form. A plural noun signifies at least three characters, but even if the Arabs at times may refer to dual with a plural noun, it will still imply that the Prophet ﷺ had more than one biological daughter. Therefore, the claim that Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها was the only biological daughter still remains incorrect and it is in conflict with the Qur'ān. It is regrettable that ʿAmmār ʿAlī was not deterred by the thought that his deception may be exposed to others and as a result felt no shame in doing so.

Nevertheless, ʿAmmār ʿAlī has no choice aside from accepting that the Prophet ﷺ had many daughters and they are Ruqayyah رضي الله عنها, Umm Kulthūm رضي الله عنها and Zaynab رضي الله عنها, since no other female has claimed to be the daughter of the Prophet ﷺ. If he fails to acknowledge this, then the following verse of the Qur'ān will apply to him:

وَمَا يَجْحَدُ بِأٰيَاتِنَا إِلَّا الْكَافِرُوْنَ

And none reject Our verses except the disbelievers.[2]

1 Sūrah al-Aḥzāb: 59.

2 Sūrah al-ʿAnkabūt: 47.

If he is still adamant and chooses to remain a disbeliever by claiming that Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها was the only biological daughter, then we have no alternative other than referring to authentic Shīʿī texts to support our claim. Surely he could not refute his own sources, but if he does, then this would only add to our delight.

The number of the Prophet's صلى الله عليه وسلم daughters in light of Shīʿī references

Perhaps a few quotations from Shīʿī references would settle this matter. *Nahj al-Balāghah* enjoys the status of a divine scripture according to the understanding of the Shīʿah and its contents are no less than the Qur'ān in authenticity. The Ithnā ʿAshariyyah maintain that its transmission is classified as *Mutawātir*[1]. ʿAllāmah al-Raḍī—the author—records the following statement of ʿAlī رضي الله عنه regarding ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه:

قد بلغت من صهره صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم ما لم ينالا ، يعني الشيخين

> You have secured a link through marriage to him [the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم] which they have not.

ʿAlī رضي الله عنه basically highlights one of the merits of ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه over Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه and ʿUmar رضي الله عنه in that he was blessed to be the son-in-law of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم twice over.

Abū Jaʿfar al-Ṭūsī—*Shaykh al-Ṭā'ifah*—records the following from Imām Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq رحمه الله in *al-Tahdhīb*, which is one of the four authentic 'ḥadīth' texts of the Shīʿah and which is on par with the *al-Kāfī* of al-Kulaynī.

كان يقول في دعائه ، أللهم صلى على رقية بنت نبيك – أللهم صلى على أم كلثوم بنت نبيك

> Imām Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq رحمه الله used to say the following in his supplications:
>
> O Allah! Shower your favours upon Ruqayyah, the daughter of your Messenger. O Allah! Shower your favours upon Umm Kulthūm, the daughter of your Messenger.

However, if even this is not satisfactory for ʿAmmār ʿAlī and he asserts that they were referred to as the Prophet's صلى الله عليه وسلم daughters on the basis of common

---

1 *Mutawātir*: A ḥadīth reported by such a large number of people that it is inconceivable for them to have all agreed upon a lie.

terminology (just as Lūṭ عليه السلام referred to the believing women among his followers as his daughters), then we will be even more determined to make him surrender. Consequently, the following narration appears in the *al-Kāfī* of al-Kulaynī:

> تزوّج رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم خديجة وهو إبن بضع و عشرين سنة ، فوُلد له منها قبل بعثه عليه السلام القاسم و رقية و زينب وأم كلثوم ، وولد له بعد المبعث الطيب والطاهر و فاطمة
>
> The Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم was over twenty at the time of his marriage to Khadījah رضي الله عنها. This marriage bore him four children prior to receiving Nubuwwah, namely Qāsim رضي الله عنه, Ruqayyah رضي الله عنها, Zaynab رضي الله عنها and Umm Kulthūm رضي الله عنها. As for those who were born after he received Nubuwwah, they were Ṭāhir رضي الله عنه, Ṭayyab رضي الله عنه and Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها.

There is no possibility of any alternate interpretation to this narration. Neither could it be said that these were referred to as the Prophet's صلى الله عليه وسلم daughters on the basis of common terminology. This narration also establishes that the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم had three other daughters besides Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها, which is the stance of the Ahl al-Sunnah. They are Zaynab رضي الله عنها, Ruqayyah رضي الله عنها, and Umm Kulthūm رضي الله عنها.

Strangely though, ʿAmmār ʿAlī's extreme caution even prevented him from saying that the Ahl al-Sunnah believe that the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم had three daughters besides Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها. Perhaps he felt that it is best to subdue the opponents view as best as one can.

And what to say about his in-depth and all-encompassing information! Subḥān Allah! He skilfully lists dozens of texts and references of the Ahl al-Sunnah as if he has perused each one of them, when he is ignorant about the basic beliefs of the Ahl al-Sunnah which is known to every Sunnī; what chance is there of him ever perusing these texts? He probably heard the names of these references as a student and then lists them as if he is intimately acquainted with them. In fact, he may have not seen some of the references cited regarding the Estate of Fadak in his dreams as well; references such as *Jamʿ al-Jawāmiʿ* and the *Musnad Imām Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal* (as they were not available in print at that time). When this is the reality of his 'association' with these references, there is no need to respond to what he ascribes to them.

No significance recorded about the other daughters

However, it is necessary for us to acknowledge the simple-mindedness of ʿAmmār ʿAlī. In order to establish that Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها was the only biological daughter of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم he states:

> **Nevertheless, even if we were to assume that these two were the daughters of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم, then we would certainly have some reports highlighting their merit just as how the merit of Sayyidah Fāṭimah al-Zahrā' رضي الله عنها is recorded in the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah, as well as in the books of the Shīʿah.**

Is this adequate proof and can this really be considered a justification for their claim? If ʿAmmār ʿAlī was not acquainted with the laws of justification and substantiation, he ought to have asked somebody at least. After all, everything that is written in his letter is but the opinion and views of others which he copied without taking any pain to verify.

Nevertheless, from the point of logic and reason this much is established that not mentioning something does not necessarily imply its non-existence but perhaps you would object to this, since you only accept proof and evidence that is based on narration and your extreme piety simply cannot tolerate any mention of subjects such as logic. So here is a portion of a verse which appears towards the end of Sūrah al-Nisā':

وَرُسُلًا قَدْ قَصَصْنٰهُمْ عَلَيْكَ مِنْ قَبْلُ وَرُسُلًا لَّمْ نَقْصُصْهُمْ عَلَيْكَ

> *And [We sent] Messengers about whom We have related [their stories] to you before and Messengers about whom We have not related to you.*[1]

Therefore, if failing to mention them necessitates their non-existence then this would result in negating the rest of the Ambiyā' who have not been mentioned in the Qur'ān, Allah forbid!

Similarly, is it necessary that all the offspring of a saint attain the same rank and position (or do they have different potentials)? If ʿAmmār ʿAlī asserts that they should all be equal than he should think carefully before taking such a view as this

1 Sūrah al-Nisā': 164.

would demand that Imām Muḥammad al-Bāqir رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ and his brother Zayd رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ—the martyr—also have the same rank. Perhaps he alleges that the Ahl al-Sunnah consider Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا and Umm Kulthūm رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا to be on the same rank; never and again I say never: the rank of Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا is uniquely enjoyed by her alone.

That is the bounty of Allah; He grants his grace to whomsoever He wishes.

ʿAmmār ʿAlī's proficiency in History

As for his statements that between Umm Kulthūm رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا and Ruqayyah رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا, one of them happened to be married to Abū al-ʿĀṣ ibn al-Rabīʿ رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ, this is glaring testimony of the marvellous retention capacity of ʿAmmār ʿAlī. My dear sir, it was Zaynab رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا who was married to Abū al-ʿĀṣ ibn al-Rabīʿ رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ. The other two daughters were initially wed to the two sons of Abū Lahab. Why do you tarnish the name of Ibn Ḥajar when you are guilty of committing the error? You commit the crime and someone else is the villain?

As for his statement that in spite of the dominance of Islam they still remained in marriage to disbelievers, this is a true height of audacity. Subḥān Allah! If they were not the biological daughters of the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ they certainly were the biological daughters of Khadījah رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا. We believe that the Shīʿah too have that much regard for Khadījah رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا that they would consider her daughters to be Muslims.

Whether anyone understands this or not, the fact remains that ʿAmmār ʿAlī himself considers them to be Muslims. If he really considered them to be disbelievers, then what was the need for the remark:

However, despite Islam gaining authority and dominance they remained in wedlock to disbelievers and the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ did not even bother to terminate their relationships with these disbelievers, so what if they were wed to ʿUthmān thereafter? As for ʿUthmān, he was a believer and far better than those disbelievers whom they were initially attached to.

In addition to this, could any Muslim ever entertain the thought that let alone his own daughters, would the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ ever allow even the least virtuous of the believing women to remain in marriage to a disbeliever when Islam was dominant?

The order of the Qur’ān to extricate Muslim women from the control of disbelievers

Forget the obligation of the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ in this regard, Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ obligates every ordinary Muslim to release Muslim women from the clutches of the disbelievers. Read the following verse if you are not convinced about this:

وَمَا لَكُمْ لَا تُقَاتِلُوْنَ فِيْ سَبِيْلِ اللّٰهِ وَالْمُسْتَضْعَفِيْنَ مِنَ الرِّجَالِ وَالنِّسَاءِ وَالْوِلْدَانِ الَّذِيْنَ يَقُوْلُوْنَ رَبَّنَا أَخْرِجْنَا مِنْ هٰذِهِ الْقَرْيَةِ الظَّالِمِ أَهْلُهَا وَاجْعَل لَّنَا مِنْ لَّدُنْكَ وَلِيًّا وَّاجْعَل لَّنَا مِنْ لَّدُنْكَ نَصِيْرًا

And what is [the matter] with you that you fight not in the cause of Allah and [for] the oppressed among men, women, and children who say, “Our Lord, take us out of this city of oppressive people and appoint for us from Yourself a protector and appoint for us from Yourself a helper?”[1]

Even the Shīʿah are aware that these verses were revealed prior to the Conquest of Makkah, when Islam was not yet a force to be reckoned with, so there is no question of the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ not having the free will to do as he wished with the Arabs. So, if ʿAmmār ʿAlī is implying that the daughters of the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ were in Makkah till the moment of the revelation of these verses, then not only is this in conflict with the true facts, it is also a subtle but direct objection against the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. However, if they say that the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ came to Madīnah long before the revelation of this verse, then we would ask what authority did the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ actually have that he preferred them remaining in wedlock to disbelievers.

However, if we are asked to state the facts then we would inform them that these two daughters were married to ʿUtbah and ʿUtaybah, the sons of Abū Lahab, prior to the Nubuwwah of the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. After the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ announced his Nubuwwah, and Abū Lahab became his avowed enemy, Abū Lahab instructed his sons to divorce the Prophet’s صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ daughters. Thereafter one of them was married to ʿUthmān صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and both daughters arrived in Madīnah Munawwarah in the very first year of the *hijrah* (emigration). At the time of the Battle of Badr,

---

1 Sūrah al-Nisā’: 75.

which took place in the second year after hijrah, one of these daughters who was already married to ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, fell seriously ill. It was on account of her critical illness that ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was instructed to remain behind in Madīnah; but it seems that accurately reporting history has terminated on ʿAmmār ʿAlī such that he has resorted to distorting the facts as he desires.

The merits of ʿUthmān, Dhū al-Nūrayn رضي الله عنه

As for the remaining allegations against ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه, by which ʿAmmār ʿAlī has invited destruction and doom upon himself, we disassociate ourselves from it completely. In our view, ʿAlī رضي الله عنه and ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه are dear and equal to us like our two eyes but ʿAmmār ʿAlī knows far better and he is in a divine position to pass judgement against him.

As for alleging that he introduced innovations, we would have responded to it had we not previously established the lofty status of the three Khulafā especially, and the rest of the Ṣaḥābah in general, when deliberating on the following verse and verses subsequent to it:

وَعَدَ اللّٰهُ الَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْا مِنْكُمْ وَ عَمِلُوْا الصّٰلِحٰتِ لَيَسْتَخْلِفَنَّهُمْ فِى الْاَرْضِ كَمَا اسْتَخْلَفَ الَّذِيْنَ مِنْ قَبْلِهِمْ

Allah has promised those who have believed among you and done righteous deeds that He will surely grant them succession [to authority] upon the earth just as He granted it to those before them.

Therefore, there is no point in responding to these hollow criticisms.

As for attributing the following narration to ʿĀ'ishah رضي الله عنها these are but fabrications of Ibn Qutaybah and Aʿtham al-Kūfī al-Simsātī:

أقتلوا نعثلا ، لعن الله نعثلا ، أقتلوا حراق المصاحف

Kill this long-bearded one! Curse be upon the long-bearded one! Kill the one who has burnt the copies of the Qur'ān.

The above individuals were extremist Shīʿah and wretched liars, notorious for their fabrications. Attributing their words to ʿĀ'ishah رضي الله عنها is like the proverb:

You pass wind and then blame someone else.

ʿAmmār ʿAlī has no shame, stating that such fabricated reports are quoted from authentic works of the Ahl al-Sunnah is another blatant lie.

ʿAmmār ʿAlī's proficiency in Arabic

You are already aware of the true state of affairs regarding the person who claims to have sound knowledge and proficiency over voluminous Arabic resources of the Ahl al-Sunnah but if you require additional clarification then consider that the verb *Uqtulū* is a verb in plural format, but he has translated it as a singular verb. However, we may overlook this as an innocent mistake which could happen to anyone. However, what should we say then about translating the phrase *Laʿan Allāh* as "curse be upon". Surely there is a distinction between the past tense and an injunction. One really wonders what standards such translations conform to. If a student who is studying primary texts such as *Mīzān* is given the meaning of the root word, he would accurately translate the verbs *Uqtulū* and *Laʿan*, but ʿAmmār ʿAlī, who has become the supreme leader of the Shīʿah Imāmiyyah, on account of this highly academic treatise cannot decipher between the injunction and the past tense, between singular and plural. We would have to accept that ʿAmmār ʿAlī is not even aware of the rudiments of Arabic grammar and that his lengthy garb and burdensome turban is but a deception. Whatever knowledge he claims to have must have been heard and received from others, yet he portrays himself to the innocent masses as a highly proficient scholar. Perhaps he has gained some basic knowledge but on account of the verse of the Qur'ān:

وَاللّٰهُ لَا يَهْدِيْ الْقَوْمَ الظّٰلِمِيْنَ

And Allah does not guide the wrong-doers.[1]

He was unable to translate it accurately; as he is guilty of harbouring evil opinions about the chosen servants of Allah, the honourable Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم.

Despite such pathetic academic ability, he is willing to debate the stance of the Ahl al-Sunnah, whose path conforms completely with the path of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم and he freely quotes references with sophisticated titles which can only be truly appreciated by a qualified scholar. Anyone who considers these flaws would realise that if we ruled out deceit as an objective, we would have to accept that ʿAmmār ʿAlī's treatise is subject to many defects and misconceptions.

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 258.

On the other hand, if these reports were to have been authentically reported in the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah, then we would have been able to respond to it adequately. Yes, these reports are certainly recorded in the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah but they are not recorded without their status being clarified as fabrications and baseless reports of the Shīʿah. Whilst this was the actual motive for recording them, ʿAmmār ʿAlī found it convenient to use it for his purposes. If this is how texts are supposed to be distorted, very soon he would probably change the law of discharging alms from the Qur'ān by misconstruing the following verse:

وَلَا يَحْسَبَنَّ الَّذِيْنَ يَبْخَلُوْنَ بِمَا أٰتَاهُمُ اللّٰهُ مِنْ فَضْلِهِ هُوَ خَيْرًا لَّهُمْ

And let not those who [greedily] withhold what Allah has given them of His bounty ever think that it is better for them.[1]

Because *It is better for them* appears at the end [so he might construe that failing to discharge the Zakāh is the best course of action even though impermissible-*translator*.

He also might consider Firʿawn to be the Rabb, Most-High, since the following appears in the Qur'ān regarding him:

فَقَالَ اَنَا رَبُّكُمُ الْاَعْلٰى

He (Firʿawn) said, "I am your Rabb, Most High."[2]

Similarly, his assertion that *Al-Istīʿāb* contains the report that the Ṣaḥābah ultimately killed ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه as they could no longer tolerate the manner in which he had disfigured the dīn, is slander and distortion of the facts. Everyone is aware that the Ahl al-Sunnah have no objections against ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه and they acknowledge his lofty position whole-heartedly. Similarly, the Ahl al-Sunnah consider those associated with bidʿah to be deviated and they oppose them uncompromisingly. Why should they not oppose those engaged in bidʿah when bidʿah by its very nature calls for the destruction of the Sunnah? Therefore, if there were any authentic texts ascribing bidʿah to ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه, the Ahl al-Sunnah, by virtue of what this title implies, would have been first to disassociate themselves from ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه, Allah forbid!

1 Sūrah Āl ʿImrān: 180.

2 Sūrah al-Nāziʿāt: 24.

The allegation of bidʿah against ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه has been masterminded by ʿAmmār ʿAlī and his peers, and they have trespassed all limits in their allegations against him.

If any sensible person were to analyse these allegations they would conclude that ʿAmmār ʿAlī is certainly an agent of Dajjāl, if not a Dajjāl himself. We have never seen such deceivers nor heard of them before. If he were to have only concealed the narrations contained in Shīʿī references, which prove that Ruqayyah رضي الله عنها and her sisters رضي الله عنهن were indeed the daughters of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم, then he could have gotten away with it. Since the possibility of a Sunnī being acquainted with the contents of Shīʿī sources is slim but what can be said about his utter shamelessness; he forges narrations and ascribes them to authentic Sunnī texts (and then expects that the Ahl al-Sunnah would not be aware of these lies).

The support for ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه from the Ahl al-Bayt and the Ṣaḥābah

It would be foolish to expect decency from those who have no vestige of *ḥayā* (modesty). It is therefore necessary to establish from authentic sources of the Ahl al-Sunnah and Shīʿah the support given to ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه by the Ahl al-Bayt and the Ṣaḥābah in general, and their willingness to defend him at all costs, so that simple-minded Muslims may not be swayed by the deception of ʿAmmār ʿAlī. These facts may possibly serve as an eye-opener for ʿAmmār ʿAlī as well.

The claims he has made are so absurd and biased that the learned and the illiterate alike can see its falsity. In essence, the confrontation that occurred between Ṭalḥah رضي الله عنه, Zubayr رضي الله عنه, ʿĀ'ishah رضي الله عنها, Muʿāwiyah رضي الله عنه, ʿAmr ibn al-ʿĀṣ رضي الله عنه and ʿAlī رضي الله عنه was only on account of seeking retribution for the assassination of ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه. Since the killers of ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه were hiding in the camp of ʿAlī رضي الله عنه. It was difficult for him to deal with them immediately on account of their large numbers and their rebellious nature. These people felt that if they had successfully brought about the end of the reign of one khalīfah, what could stop them from doing it again. As for Ṭalḥah رضي الله عنه and Zubayr رضي الله عنه, they felt that ʿAlī رضي الله عنه was not dealing swiftly with the matter. As for Muʿāwiyah رضي الله عنه and his forces, they thought that ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه was murdered by the incitation of ʿAlī رضي الله عنه (due to the propaganda of the rebels).

Nevertheless, the historical records of the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Shīʿah are available for recourse. The Ṣaḥābah made every effort to subdue the rebels but what was divinely ordained had to occur. The Ṣaḥābah initially resorted to dialogue with the rebels but when their attempts were met with failure, they sought permission to wage war against them from ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. ʿUthmān was not prepared to entertain this idea and the Ṣaḥābah were left with no option but to allow matters to take its course. Despite this, they made attempts to the very end to deliver water to him and to drive the rebels away. Zayd bin Thābit رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ along with a group of Anṣār offered to fulfil their role as the helpers of the dīn of Allah once again.

ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ came to ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and told him that these rebels were the very same people who came into Islam after being defeated by the Ṣaḥābah and the era of their defeat was still fresh in their minds. However, they have used their declaration of faith as a shield knowing that ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ would honour such a declaration and be restricted by it. Ibn ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ said that if ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ permitted, the Ṣaḥābah would once again deal with them and remind them of the manner in which they had suffered defeat and humiliation not too long ago. ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ disapproved of this and did not want the blood of the Muslims to be spilled in defence of his life.

Similarly, Ḥasan and Ḥusayn, ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿUmar, ʿAbd Allah ibn Zubayr, Abū Hurayrah, ʿĀmir ibn Rabīʿ and many other Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ remained with ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ in his home and whenever the rebels attempted to enter his home, they repelled them with sticks and stones and secured the entrance once again.

As for the slaves of ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, they were a force on their own. They gathered their arms and begged ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ to allow them to deal with these rebels. They told him that since they had played glorious roles in the conquests of the Muslims from Khurāsān to Africa, they would settle the matter decisively and teach the rebels a lesson. The rebels were using the declaration of faith as a shield and they were immune to the words of the senior Companions of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.

However, ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ only responded by saying that if they wished to please him, they should disarm and remain confined to their homes. He also offered freedom to those among them who disarmed. He said that he would prefer to die before any blood was spilt as opposed to dying after blood was spilt. Since he was promised

martyrdom, he would meet his coveted end any way. What was the benefit in spilling the blood of others too, when he was to be martyred all the same?

Sunnī and Shīʿī reports state that ʿAlī رضي الله عنه assigned his sons, the children of Jaʿfar and his slave Qambar to the door of ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه. Ṭalḥah رضي الله عنه and Zubayr رضي الله عنه also assigned their sons to the same post, so that they could repel the rebels. Thus, whenever the rebels advanced they would be repulsed with sticks and staffs. This confrontation led to Ḥasan رضي الله عنه sustaining many wounds. Muḥammad ibn Ṭalḥah رضي الله عنه and Qambar sustained head injuries. When the rebels realised that they could not advance from the main entrance they proceeded from the rear and entered the home of ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه after forcing entry through the rear wall of his neighbours from the Anṣār. They then succeeded in assassinating ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه.

ʿAlī رضي الله عنه defends Sayyidunā ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه

A report from *Nahj al-Balāghah*, the most authentic Shīʿī reference, contains the following words of ʿAlī رضي الله عنه:

والله لقد دفعت عنه

By the oath of Allah; I repelled the rebels from ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه.

The Shīʿī scholars comment on this by saying that when the rebels laid siege to the home of ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه, ʿAlī رضي الله عنه visited him on many occasions and he would repel and curse the rebels every time he came and went.

Ibn Aʿtham al-Kūfī, the notorious Shīʿī historian and one who bears intense hatred for ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه and other Ṣaḥābah, records in *al-Futūḥ* that ʿAlī رضي الله عنه sent Ḥasan رضي الله عنه to ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه, to inform him that he had his complete support and that he was aware of the false allegations of the rebels and their resolve to assassinate him. He also said that ʿAlī رضي الله عنه feared that ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه could be harmed and he was ready to stand by his side and defend him against the rebels and ward them off by all means possible if ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه permitted this.

Ḥasan رضي الله عنه relayed this message but ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه said that he did not want ʿAlī رضي الله عنه to undertake any hardship or confront the rebels. He told Ḥasan رضي الله عنه that he had seen the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم in his dream telling him that if he fought against the rebels, he would be victorious, but if he did not fight them then he would terminate his fast with the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم. He then expressed his desire to be reunited with

the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم and to terminate his fast in his blessed company. Ḥasan رضي الله عنه was left with no choice.

ʿAlī رضي الله عنه was not displaying hypocritical behaviour

No sincere Muslim will ever suggest that ʿAlī رضي الله عنه was hypocritical in his actions and dealings. If the Shīʿah maintain that this was hypocritical behaviour on the basis of

المرؤ يقيس على نفسه

A man judges others by his own standards.

then who has endorsed the īmān of the Shīʿah? Allah forbid that any allegations of hypocrisy be made against ʿAlī رضي الله عنه.

If by an impossible assumption, it is agreed that he certainly was hypocritical at this juncture then what pressure was he possibly bowing to when he delivered the sermon in Kūfah wherein he stated under oath that he had repelled the murderers of ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه several times. ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه was history by that time and complete authority rested with ʿAlī رضي الله عنه. Even a coward does not fear a deceased enemy, and he would not care less about being unarmed before the corpse of his enemy. Why is it that despite his valour and bravery, ʿAlī رضي الله عنه was still terrified of ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه? If the Shīʿah claim that ʿAlī رضي الله عنه had double standards, then why would he make such clear declarations even when ʿUthmān صلى الله عليه وسلم was no longer a threat?

The effort of other Ṣaḥābah in defending ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه

On the other hand, ʿAbd Allah ibn Salām رضي الله عنه repeatedly asked the rebels to refrain from assassinating ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه, as his demise would open the flood-gates of mischief and strife. As for Ḥudhayfah ibn al-Yamān رضي الله عنه, who possessed knowledge of the names of the hypocrites, which ʿAlī رضي الله عنه affirmed and testified to, Shīʿī references state that he exhorted the rebels to desist from executing their plot. He cautioned them that the martyrdom of ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه would result in many trials and tribulations.

Now if anyone were to ask ʿAmmār ʿAlī about the above mentioned people; were they not the Ṣaḥābah? As for ʿAlī رضي الله عنه, he alone is equivalent to thousands of

Ṣaḥābah, especially according to the Shīʿah. So if the Ṣaḥābah were the ones who killed ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ then ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, who is a great Ṣaḥābī, was opposed to this. Strangely though, ʿAmmār ʿAlī alleges that it is the Ṣaḥābah who ultimately killed ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, then it struck me suddenly that ʿAmmār ʿAlī and the rest of the Shīʿah leadership do not consider the above-mentioned people (including ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ) to be Ṣaḥābah. Instead, the Ṣaḥābah according to them were the villains and rebels of Kūfah and Egypt, the actual people who gathered and marched to assassinate ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. Therefore, his claim that the Ṣaḥābah murdered ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is correct by his own definition of Ṣaḥābah.

Nevertheless, the reality is that his allegation against the Ṣaḥābah is vicious slander and misrepresentation of the facts. One who has no fear of Allah and no shame for people is capable of almost anything. We are still baffled by his audacity, that he states he is willing to forward the chain of transmission for these fabricated reports and allegations for anyone who may require it.

Assessing the allegation of cowardice against ʿAlī رضي الله عنه

Regarding the conflict between ʿAlī رضي الله عنه and ʿĀ'ishah رضي الله عنها, ʿAmmār ʿAlī rightfully states that there was only one confrontation and that these confrontations were not prompted by desire for wealth or worldly gain. Yet even though we are aware of the proverb:

الكذوب قد يصدق

A liar does speak the truth at times.

we have no clue why he did not lie at this juncture.

However, even though he is absolved of lying, he has intentionally ignored another reality. He says that it was not possible for ʿAlī رضي الله عنه to wage jihād against the first three Khulafā' as he had no supporters. It is agreed that one person alone cannot face an entire army and support is essential. So, if the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم avoided confrontation with the disbelievers until after he gained the support of the Anṣār by migrating to Madīnah then what excuse does ʿAlī رضي الله عنه have for not waging war all by himself when he has made glorious claims about himself?

ʿAllāmah al-Raḍī records the following in *Nahj al-Balāghah*, which has the most sublime status in Shīʿī literature:

> قال أمير المؤمنين : إني والله لو لقيتُهم واحدا وهم طلاع الأرض كلَّها ما باليت ولا استوحشتُ ، وإني من ضلالتهم التي فيها والهدي الذي أنا عليه لعلى بصيرة من نفسي ، ويقين من ربي ، وإني إلى لقاء الله ولحسن ثوابه لمنتظر وراجٍ
>
> ʿAlī رضي الله عنه said: "Certainly by the oath of Allah, if I were to confront them all alone, and the entire earth was full of them, I would not be bothered nor would I feel any fear. And I have complete insight and conviction from my Rabb about the misguidance they are in and the guidance I am upon. And I am eager to meet my Rabb and I am hopeful of his handsome reward, anticipating it anxiously."

What support and help does he require, one who cares less if the entire world were against him and he were confronting them all by himself?

Yes, if the Imāms did not have control over their own lives then we could have said that not bothering or not fearing does not necessarily mean that he would not lose his life in the process. Therefore, it may have occurred to him that if I were to face them all by myself the chances of victory are far-fetched but if I am slain in the process then what is the benefit? The purpose of jihād is to elevate the dīn of Allah and if that cannot be accomplished then merely sacrificing one's life has no real purpose.

ʿAlī رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ has control over his own life according to Shīʿah

Since the Imām has control over his own life as al-Kulaynī has established and the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah are unanimous upon this, then waging jihād all by himself against the enemy would have had such positive effects for the upliftment of dīn much greater than waging jihād along with supporters. If he was able to survive the attack of the enemy whilst being surrounded by his supporters then it is no great accomplishment, but if he prevailed all by himself it would have been the most supernatural feat.

Hindus are thrilled and easily swayed by phenomenal feats. If they had to observe such a feat, they would not hesitate to declare their faith all at once. Therefore, if ʿAlī رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ were to wage such a jihād once or twice only, the worst that could happen is that he would sustain wounds or lose consciousness but the impression that would have been created in the minds of people would have led friend and foe flocking into Islam. It would have outshone the achievements of the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ by far since the disbelievers knew that the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ was dependent on his forces whenever he faced them in battle and since it was a question of might and military strength, they also entertained thoughts of defeating him and they mustered the courage to confront him again and again.

If ʿAlī رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ fought those battles, then whatever was expected to be realised and achieved through Imām al-Mahdī would have been achieved long before and the Ahl al-Bayt would have been spared from the tribulations they faced.

But alas, not only did ʿAlī رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ shirk from waging war against the three Khulafā', he also could not face up to them and say to them even a little of the truth which the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ said to Abū Jahal, Abū Lahab, Walīd ibn ʿUtbah and Umayyah ibn Khalaf. Surprisingly, despite the Prophet's صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ unparalleled bravery and

courage, there is no similar narration highlighting these feats in any way. Moreover, the Prophet ﷺ opposed the disbelievers all by himself and endured such persecution and hardship that ultimately compelled him to bid farewell to his land of origin. Yet, despite such cowardice ʿAlī رضي الله عنه still remains the unparalleled hero.

ʿAlī رضي الله عنه lived in fear and humiliation all his life according to the Shīʿah

ʿAlī رضي الله عنه never had even one opportunity in his life when he could proclaim the truth and endure hardship for the noble cause. Perhaps at the least he could have emigrated from Madīnah and earned the rewards of emigration. Instead he remained in their midst like one of them and continued to perform ṣalāh behind them, listening to their sermons on Fridays and ʿĪd celebrations. He even strengthened familial ties with them and passed his life in this manner. If not anything else, he could have at least avoided Taqiyyah as the Prophet ﷺ avoided Taqiyyah.

Therefore, it is baseless to say that ʿAlī رضي الله عنه did not wage jihād because he had no support. In fact, it is tantamount to disbelief in him as he said that he feared less even if the whole world confronted him and he was all alone. Added to this is that he was in control of his own life and his chances of prevailing were certain. How could ʿAmmār ʿAlī then say that he required support to wage jihād.

Similarly, if one were to page through Shīʿī references one would find reports stating that all the Anṣār of the Prophet ﷺ remained loyal to ʿAlī رضي الله عنه. Therefore, when he had the support of the Anṣār and their progeny, why did he not wage jihād during the reign of the first three Khulafā'.

The truth is that ʿAlī رضي الله عنه whole-heartedly supported the first three Khulafā' and he was loyal and devoted to them, especially the first two Khulafā', whom he continued to praise throughout his own reign as Khalīfah, wherein he was not experiencing circumstances necessitating Taqiyyah. The majority of the Imāmiyyah scholars maintain that Taqiyyah was prohibited upon him during his reign as the Khalīfah as has been established previously. Similarly, the first three Khulafā' were history by this time and who was ʿAlī رضي الله عنه to fear dead people.

Considering all these facts, as well as the phenomenal bravery, courage and firm faith of ʿAlī رضي الله عنه there is no other explanation other than stating that ʿAlī رضي الله عنه considered their Khilāfah legitimate and valid.

ʿAlī رضي الله عنه could not stand up for Fāṭimah's رضي الله عنها rights

Whilst ʿAmmār ʿAlī rightfully states that jihād is not waged for wealth and worldly matters, we would ask whether aiding the oppressed is part of Islam or not? And more so when the oppressed is none other than the beloved daughter of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم. If helping such an oppressed person not an essential Islamic duty? Despite his phenomenal ability, the support of the Anṣār and their progenies, why then did he fail to help Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها? If she had forgiven her oppressors, then it would have been a different issue entirely but ʿAmmār ʿAlī says that she carried this grudge to her grave and refused to have anything to do with Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه. On the contrary if you insist that assisting the oppressed is a worldly matter and it has no relation with dīn then surely it would be prohibited to assist and there would be no reward for such an endeavour. In this situation, the objection of the Shīʿah against the Ṣaḥābah for failing to support ʿAlī رضي الله عنه is also futile.

However, we believe that ʿAmmār ʿAlī considers aiding the oppressed incumbent and regards it to be a part of Islam. This is because the Noble Qur'ān as well as aḥādīth records of the Ahl al-Sunnah, and Shīʿah for that matter, are filled with reports of this nature. However, since criticism of the Ṣaḥābah is the objective, they must be criticised even if ʿAlī's رضي الله عنه position is compromised in the process.

Nevertheless, we are convinced that our discussion on Taqiyyah thus far would compel ʿAmmār ʿAlī to agree, even if not verbally, that ʿAlī's رضي الله عنه pledge of allegiance to the first three Khulafā' and his silence on the issue of Fadak was on account of his belief that they were upon truth, and not Taqiyyah in any form.

As for what is to follow from here on, it will only give emphasis to what has been established thus far. It will impress on the minds of readers, who actually value ʿAlī رضي الله عنه and acknowledge his true worth. Are they—who do not consider his association with the three Khulafā' to be hypocritical but rather that it is was done seeking the pleasure of Allah—on truth or those who maintain that he lived in humiliation and suppression, deprived of his free will and choice, forced to observe double-standards and conceal the truth till the end? And despite knowing the implications of the following verse, he assimilated with the three Khulafā' and the forces of falsehood, thereby obscuring the truth and concealing the truth despite being the flag-bearer of the cause of truth himself.

The Nikāḥ of Umm Kulthūm bint ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا

The third issue in his letter pertains to the marriage of Umm Kulthūm رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا, who is the biological daughter of ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا. Consequently, he states that she was married to Muḥammad ibn Jaʿfar al-Ṭayyār رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. Whilst this response is correct, it is completely evading the actual objective of the questioner. The questioner actually wishes to verify if Umm Kulthūm رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ had been married to ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ or not, but ʿAmmār ʿAlī steers clearly away from the issue. Perhaps he did not realise the actual objective. Either way his shrewdness has been exposed.

One wonders how ʿAmmār ʿAlī could have forgotten his previous trick when responding to this question or did he find it convenient to do so. Umm Kulthūm رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا would have to question him about his reason for severing the ties of kinship of her maternal aunts from the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and depriving her of this benefit. Is she not one of the Ahl al-Bayt, equally entitled to such a privilege? But I would take the liberty of answering on behalf of ʿAmmār ʿAlī ṣāḥib by saying that he considered the rule of "The seniors are more entitled to privileges". Since this is an established rule, why should it be opposed?

ʿAmmār ʿAlī thought that perhaps his critics would think that the marriage of Umm Kulthūm رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا, daughter of Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا, to ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is a unique issue and it has no resemblance to the marriages of Ruqayyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا and Umm Kulthūm رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا, the daughters of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ to ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. Therefore, he concealed the reality fearing that someone may draw resemblances from these two instances but let me make it known that both instances are equal according to the Ahl al-Sunnah and there is no difference at all.

Now ʿAmmār ʿAlī should rectify his previous statement and write to Mīr Nādir ʿAlī informing him that Umm Kulthūm رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا was not the biological daughter of Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا, and he should not fear any reproach from the Ahl al-Sunnah because the option of Badā' is always there for such errors. After all, ʿAmmār ʿAlī is certainly not greater than Allah than he cannot be a victim of the accursed Badā'. If despite his all-encompassing knowledge Allah Taʿālā has instances of Badā' then ʿAmmār ʿAlī is human after all.

Nevertheless, it would have been wiser to say that Umm Kulthūm رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا is the biological daughter of Asmā' bint ʿUmays رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا instead. If this is a blatant lie, then

who cares? After all the relationship of the Prophet ﷺ with his daughters was rejected, so what if his granddaughter's ties of kinship are denied as well. When people speak so many lies for worldly gain what harm could there be in speaking a lie or two for the preservation of one's dīn. Instead, lying in this case could be a tremendous virtue as it preserves the dīn and affords one the opportunity to follow in the footsteps of one's seniors and illustrious Imāms who lied freely under the pretext of Taqiyyah.

ʿAmmār ʿAlī's deception

Let us elaborate further on the response given by ʿAmmār ʿAlī. Whilst he has benefitted from his shrewd response, he has sustained some harm too. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ says the following:

وَلَا تَلْبِسُوا الْحَقَّ بِالْبَاطِلِ وَتَكْتُمُوْا الْحَقَّ وَاَنْتُمْ تَعْلَمُوْنَ

And do not mix the truth with falsehood or conceal the truth while you know [it].[1]

وَلَا تَكْتُمُوا الشَّهَادَةَ وَمَن يَّكْتُمْهَا فَإِنَّهُ أٰثِمٌ قَلْبُهُ

And do not conceal testimony, for whoever conceals it, his heart is indeed sinful.[2]

Ponder over these two verses carefully, but before clarifying its implication I must make it known that I err in doing so because what tremendous effort has ʿAmmār ʿAlī not spared in portraying falsehood as truth and concealing the truth that he would now be deterred from doing so by these two verses. Could there be a greater misrepresentation of the truth than failing to mention the marriage of ʿUmar رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ to Umm Kulthūm bint ʿAlī رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا? If he were to have refuted Umm Kulthūm's رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا relationship with Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا and ʿAlī رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ then it would not be classified as misrepresentation of the truth. Instead it would be rejection of the truth which is termed as Juḥūd in the Qur'ān and the following verse will be applicable:

وَمَا يَجْحَدُ بِأٰيَاتِنَا إِلَّا كُلُّ خَتَّارٍ كَفُوْرٍ

And none rejects Our signs except everyone treacherous and ungrateful.[3]

---

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 42.

2 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 283.

3 Sūrah Luqmān: 32.

As for the manner in which ʿAmmār ʿAlī responded, he has adopted the path which satisfies the listener without endangering his position. Similarly, he is not really at fault for this because misrepresentation is only evil if it deceives someone and this is not so because the Ahl al-Sunnah have accessed those Shīʿī reports which establish that Umm Kulthūm رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا was indeed married to ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. If you are not convinced, then here are the reports for your inspection.

ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ performed her nikāḥ

Qāḍī Nūr Allāh, al-Shahīd al-Rabīʿ, states the following whilst writing about ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, the uncle of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ:

> The Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ was very fond of ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and he would say that Abbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is in the place of his father.

He then goes on recording many merits of ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and says:

> ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ presented ʿUmar's proposal to ʿAlī عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ and ʿAlī عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ rejected it at first. He proposed for the second time on behalf of ʿUmar and this time ʿAlī عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ remained silent. ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ then performed Umm Kulthūm's رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا nikāḥ and she was married to ʿUmar. However, on account of Taqiyyah ʿAlī عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ could not prevent this from happening, so he remained silent.

This is what the Qāḍī states in his book.

ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ will be among those who will be on the Aʿrāf according to the Shīʿah

I have referred to ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ with honour by adding *Radī Allāh ʿanhu* to his name but this does not occur in the actual text. Would the Shīʿah even honour him? Whilst their enmity for ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is known and their affiliation with the Ahl al-Bayt is repeatedly proclaimed, they actually maintain that ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ would be on the Aʿrāf on the Day of Resurrection. Their claims are hollow since everyone knows that one who was so dear to the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ could never be detained on the Aʿrāf. In fact, the possibility of those who merely love him entering paradise is not far-fetched. Whilst this is their belief regarding the esteemed uncle of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, they believe that those who love ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and those whom he loves cannot be adversely affected by their sins, not even by being guilty of kufr.

The beloved of the Prophet ﷺ in Aʿrāf whilst Jews and Christians in Paradise?

Consequently, the Shīʿah scholar Raḍī al-Dīn declares the Christian, Zunaynā ibn Isḥāq to be an inmate of Paradise on account of a few couplets she recited in praise of ʿAlī رضي الله عنه, even though the very same couplets attest to him being a Christian. The couplets are:

عدي وتيم لا أحاول ذكرهم   بسوء ولكني محب لهاشم

وما يعتريني في علي وأهله   إذا ذكروا في الله لومة لائم

يقولون ما بال النصاري لحبهم   وأهل النبي من اعرب واعاجم

فقلت لهم إني لأحسب حبهم   سرى في قلوب الخلق حتى البهائم

I do not make efforts to adversely mention the tribes of ʿAdī and Taym,

however, I am a lover of the Hāshim tribe;

when ʿAlī and his family are mentioned I am not,

taken over by any sentiment of apprehension for the next;

they ask why is it the Christians love him,

as well as the Prophet's followers both Arab and non-Arab;

I say to them, I believe the love for them,

has penetrated the hearts of all creation, even the animals.

Similarly, all the scholars of the Shīʿah have high regards for Ibn Faḍlūn, who was a Jew, on account of the following couplets:

رب هب لي من المعيشة سؤلي   واعف عني بحق آل الرسول

واسقني شربة بكـــف علي   سيد الأولياء بـــعل بـــتول

O Lord grant me the prayers of my life,

and forgive me by virtue of the family of the Prophet;

and give me to drink from the hands of ʿAlī,

the leader of the pious, the husband of Fāṭimah.

Nevertheless, what can be said about the rank of ʿAlī رضي الله عنه; those who love him are entitled to Paradise despite their disbelief whilst the one whom the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم loved will be restrained from entering Paradise and held back on Aʿrāf. His beloved in this instance is none other than his own uncle who was a great believer. If he had been a disbeliever, he would not even have reached Aʿrāf, since the Qur'ān says the following about the disbelievers:

إِنَّا أَعْتَدْنَا لِلْكَافِرِيْنَ سَلَاسِلَ وَأَغْلَالًا وَّسَعِيْرًا

Indeed, We have prepared for the disbelievers chains and shackles and a blaze.[1]

وَالَّذِيْنَ كَفَرُوْا لَهُمْ نَارُ جَهَنَّمَ لَا يُقْضٰى عَلَيْهِمْ فَيَمُوْتُوْا وَلَا يُخَفَّفُ عَنْهُمْ مِّنْ عَذَابِهَا ؕ كَذٰلِكَ نَجْزِيْ كُلَّ كَفُوْرٍ

And for those who disbelieve will be the fire of Hell. [Death] is not decreed for them so they may die, nor will its torment be lightened for them. Thus do we recompense every ungrateful one.[2]

Nevertheless, we should assess the claim of the learned Qāḍī: What did he claim and what does he actually establish through this claim? Surprisingly, his claim establishes that ʿAlī رضي الله عنه also regarded ʿAbbās رضي الله عنه to be in the position of a father. Assuming that he was not willing to accept the proposal, ʿAbbās رضي الله عنه was not one who could be ignored. Therefore, he knew that it was best to honour him and accept the request. His silence was surely not on account of Taqiyyah.

ʿAlī's رضي الله عنه silence reflects his approval

We have established that Umm Kulthūm رضي الله عنها was certainly married to ʿUmar رضي الله عنه. As for the allegation of Taqiyyah, any sensible person knows that this is merely the imagination of the Shīʿah. The narration itself discredits the possibility of Taqiyyah. Every Muslim knows that Taqiyyah has no relationship with ʿAlī's رضي الله عنه character at all. Would a lion ever fear a jackal? Would it ever be possible to conceive that he resorted to Taqiyyah in an issue as sensitive as this? Even a disbeliever who is immoral and unworthy by all standards would not tolerate such

1 Sūrah al-Dahr: 4.

2 Sūrah al-Fāṭir: 36.

an episode. Similarly, it is impossible to imagine the beloved of the Prophet ﷺ committing such a heinous crime against the family of the Prophet ﷺ. Similarly, the Prophet's ﷺ love for anyone determines that he is accepted and he is upon truth. So, when the beloved of the Prophet ﷺ is upon truth would he ever commit the crime of handing the honourable granddaughter over to an enemy?

If we were to assume that ʿAlī رضي الله عنه approved of her marriage to ʿUmar رضي الله عنه on account of Taqiyyah then the crime that he is guilty of (by giving his daughter to an enemy) is more disgusting than the Taqiyyah itself. O Shīʿah! If it is ʿUmar رضي الله عنه that you hate, then why do you vilify ʿAlī رضي الله عنه along with ʿUmar رضي الله عنه?

If ʿUmar رضي الله عنه is a kāfir then ʿAlī رضي الله عنه is no less

It should be noted that if ʿAlī رضي الله عنه is a Muslim of perfect faith then the same applies to ʿUmar رضي الله عنه, because ʿAlī رضي الله عنه gave his daughter to ʿUmar رضي الله عنه. However, if ʿUmar رضي الله عنه is a disbeliever, then the same applies to ʿAlī رضي الله عنه, and if he not a disbeliever, then certainly a blatant transgressor for marrying his daughter to ʿUmar رضي الله عنه (who was a disbeliever according to the Shīʿah). If he gave her in marriage by his own choice then there is no doubt about his kufr but if he was compelled then despite his capabilities, did he not even have the dignity and self-respect which even a lowly cobbler has?

O my Rabb; you are aware that I am in complete disagreement with such beliefs and I have written these lines about the marriage of the daughter of Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها so that ʿAmmār ʿAlī may not harbour evil thoughts about ʿAlī رضي الله عنه.

This marriage is established from Shīʿī sources

We now undertake to prove Qāḍī Nūr Allāh wrong from the testimony of his very own Imāmī. Accordingly, the Shīʿī sources contain reports which state that ʿAlī رضي الله عنه had indeed married Umm Kulthūm رضي الله عنها to ʿUmar رضي الله عنه as he was worthy and deserving of this honour. He did not do so under duress. Read the following:

سئل الإمام محمد بن على الباقر عن تزويجها فقال: لولا إنه رآه أهلا لما كان يزوجها إياه، وكانت اشرف نساء العالمين، جدّها رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم، وأخواها الحسن والحسين – سيدا شباب اهل الجنة، وأبوها

علي – ذو الشرف والمنقبة في الإسلام ، وأمّها فاطمة بنت محمد صلى الله عليه وسلم ، وجدتها خديجة بنت خويلد رضي الله عنها

Imām al-Bāqir ﵀ was asked about the reason for marrying her to him [ʿUmar ﵁]. He said that if ʿAlī ﵁ felt that ʿUmar ﵁ was not worthy and deserving of her then he would have never approved of the marriage. She was the most honourable woman in the world at that time. Her grandfather was the Prophet ﷺ; her brothers were Ḥasan ﵁ and Ḥusayn ﵁, the leaders of the youth of Paradise, her father was ʿAlī ﵁ who has a prestigious position in Islam; her mother was Fāṭimah ﵂, daughter of the Prophet ﷺ and her grandmother was Khadījah bint Khuwaylid ﵂.

The Shīʿah do not love the Ahl al-Bayt and they hate the Ṣaḥābah

Consider the above narration against the allegations of their Qāḍī. How deceitful and cunning are they. They claim that their hatred for the Ṣaḥābah is on account of their love for the Ahl al-Bayt. We feel that the actual reality is that they align themselves to the Ahl al-Bayt due to their hatred for the Ṣaḥābah. However, the Ahl al-Bayt do not seem to be drawn to them. Instead, they are inclining to this course, i.e. the path of the Ṣaḥābah and the Ahl al-Sunnah. This is established from the words of Imām al-Bāqir ﵀ and Taqiyyah was completely forbidden for him, as has been recorded previously with a quotation from their sources.

After he has set the record straight would they persist upon defaming ʿAlī ﵁, Ḥasan ﵁, Ḥusayn ﵁, and the Banū Hāshim by asserting that they were immoral and shameless and that they subjected the innocent and pure granddaughter of the Prophet to *zinā* (fornication) despite her being exalted in the following verse:

إِنَّمَا يُرِيْدُ اللّٰهُ لِيُذْهِبَ عَنكُمُ الرِّجْسَ أَهْلَ الْبَيْتِ وَيُطَهِّرَكُمْ تَطْهِيْرًا

Allah intends only to remove from you the impurity [of sin], O people of the [Prophet's] household, and to purify you with [extensive] purification.[1]

May Allah take such wretched ones to task! The Ahl al-Bayt are certainly incensed and angry with them, even those with weak īmān shudder at such blasphemy. How

1 Sūrah al-Aḥzāb: 33.

daring are they that they portray their vice as virtue and slander their Imāms. They place the blame of their sins upon Imām Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ and slander him and they use such words to absolve themselves of blame for this marriage that one fears to utter it. They say:

وهو أول فرج غصب منا

This was the first woman to be abducted from us.

(Note: This is not the literal translation of these vile words but a subtle indication of its shameful purport- translator)

O Allah! You are aware that I disassociate myself from entertaining such beliefs and I record these words with the understanding that reporting a statement of kufr does not render one a kāfir. Perhaps one who has been deceived by the Shīʿah may consider their wicked statements and return to the Straight Path.

If love of ʿAlī رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ entitles one to Paradise then why not ties of kinship

It is tragic that the Ahl al-Bayt suffered such misfortune on account of the Shīʿah hatred for ʿUmar رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ but ʿUmar رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ could not be forgiven and blessed by virtue of the sanctity of the Ahl al-Bayt (with whom he was intimately associated with). Is his association of marriage less than the worth of the couplets of Zunaynā ibn Isḥāq—the Christian—and Ibn Faḍlūn—the Jew? Love for ʿAlī رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ is so potent that kufr can be disregarded despite the Qur'ān stating that hell is the abode of the disbelievers. Can love for ʿAlī رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ then not secure the forgiveness of those related to him?

Nevertheless, the Shīʿī scholars are unanimous about the marriage of Umm Kulthūm رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا to ʿUmar رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ. However, some ignorant ones state the truth, but their manner of expression is gross and uncouth (referring to the Arabic quotation recorded above). Moreover, we are bound to take what is correct and disregard that which is reprehensive on the basis of:

خذ ما صفا ودع ما كدر

Take what is pure and discard what is tainted.

As far as ʿAmmār ʿAlī is concerned, he has surpassed them all. He realised that expressing the truth about this marriage would jeopardise the entire Shīʿī faith.

Not only that, it would demand that the Shīʿah revere ʿUmar رضي الله عنه a thousand times more than what the Ahl al-Sunnah revere him because he would then be a member of the Ahl al-Bayt.

And in the case of Taqiyyah, despite it being a false allegation, the same problem arises. In fact, it is worse in this instance because accepting the wrongs of ʿUmar رضي الله عنه on account of the Ahl al-Bayt is lesser than not listening to the Ahl al-Bayt on account of ʿUmar رضي الله عنه having to be one of them.

And it was on account of this accusation of Taqiyyah that ʿAlī رضي الله عنه was accused of being absolutely shameless, undignified, cowardly and weak in religious matters. Therefore, I feel that ʿAmmār ʿAlī was wise and he felt that since falsehood is itself bad, rather just avoid the truth as well.

On the whole this response reflects cleverness and perhaps we should take the opportunity of stating the reality so that if not all at once, perhaps it will gradually appeal to him.

It is also necessary for us to record additional narrations for two benefits. Firstly, it would decrease his rage and hatred for ʿUmar رضي الله عنه and secondly, the fact that there are multiple narrations about this, would force him to be ashamed of himself and surrender, albeit reluctantly.

The narration is as follows:

روا إبن ابي الحديد شارح نهج البلاغة في قصة تزويج أم كلثوم ، فجاء عمر إلى مجلس المهاجرين بالروضة وقال : رفّؤني رفّؤني ، قالوا : بما ذا يا امير المؤمنين؟ قال : تزوجت أمّ كلثوم ن بنت علي بن ابي طالب

Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd—the commentator of *Nahj al-Balāghah*—records the following regarding the marriage of Umm Kulthūm رضي الله عنها: ʿUmar رضي الله عنه came to a group of the Muhājirīn who were seated in the Rawḍah and said to them: "Congratulate me! Congratulate me!"

When they asked him why, he informed them that he had contracted a marriage with Umm Kulthūm رضي الله عنها, the daughter of ʿAlī bin Abī Ṭālib رضي الله عنه.

This narration indicates that ʿUmar رضي الله عنه considered this marriage to be a great blessing. This narration is sufficient for those who are impartial, to make them

have great regard for ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. This is because he was celebrating his association with the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ through this union. As for those who cannot understand this, we are not compelled to shove it down their throats.

ʿUmar's رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ children from this union

Before terminating this discussion, it is important to highlight a fact just in case any Shīʿah decides to save face by stating that ʿUmar had not consummated this marriage to Umm Kulthūm رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا due to the intervention of a Jinn similar to the incident relating to Sārah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا, the wife of Ibrāhīm عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ. So even though this is established to be a lie on the basis of the unrealistic report attributed to Imām Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq, it is nonetheless established through Tawātur that Umm Kulthūm رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا bore a son from this union, whose name was Zayd. This child lived till the age of twenty and was then martyred in one of the internal feuds of the Banū ʿAdī. *To Allah do we belong and unto Him shall we return.* His mother passed away on the same day after succumbing to an illness. Nine people passed away on that dreadful day and the funeral prayers and burial proceedings were offered by Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.

Umm Kulthūm رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا remained married to ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ till the end of his life. Sārah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا cannot boast of being the granddaughter of someone as prestigious as the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, so when she was saved in an instant, Umm Kulthūm رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا ought to have been released from this marriage even quicker than that.

The Discussion Relating to the Fadak Estate

All praises belong to Allah, we have responded adequately to all the allegations of ʿAmmār ʿAlī. However, in response to his allegations and accusations regarding the Fadak Estate, we ought to have retaliated *tit for tat*, but it is not appropriate for us to stoop to such levels and utter that which intelligent and noble people would consider offensive or shameful.

Firstly, taking ʿAmmār ʿAlī to task for vilifying the three Khulafā' is akin to somebody resolving to slap a dog for spitting at the sun or punishing someone who spits at the sun/moon by pouring urine on them. It is evident that the sun or moon is unaffected by such worthless gestures. Instead, such foolish antics only laud the lofty status of the sun or the moon, as filth and abuse cannot taint it. Secondly, whilst the sun and the moon remain in its splendour, dogs and those who stoop lower than that can only be condemned to their fate because they feel no shame upon their despicability, and besides wasting time and effort, they achieve nothing from their endeavours.

ʿAmmār ʿAlī's vilification of the three Khulafā' can be compared to the above example; his filthy utterances only serve to establish the lofty status of the three Khulafā'. The three Khulafā' are radiant like the sun and the moon, and if dogs spit at them then what else could be expected from the dog? Secondly, like the dog has no relation to the radiant sun, ʿAmmār ʿAlī enjoys no status in relation to the three Khulafā' whereby we could feel a sense of relief in retaliating for his vilification of them. The worst of his insults cannot tarnish their image in the least and devoting time to express disassociation to the three Khulafā' and vilifying them is just a waste of time.

Lastly, responding to a fool magnifies his importance and we certainly do not wish to accord him such attention.

Love of the Ahl al-Bayt and the Ṣaḥābah

Love for the Ahl al-Bayt is at the very core of our faith and we maintain that love for them and the Ṣaḥābah of the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ are the two wings with which we soar and transcend. Just as it is impossible for a bird to take flight with one wing only, so too is it impossible for īmān to be the means for achieving the ultimate success referred to in the following two verses:

وَأُولٰئِكَ هُمُ الْفَائِزُوْنَ

And it is those who are the attainers [of success].[1]

فَقَدْ فَازَ فَوْزًا عَظِيْمًا

Has certainly attained a great attainment.[2]

In fact, īmān without these two wings would be like the īmān referred to in the following verse:

لَا يَنْفَعُ نَفْسًا إِيْمَانُهَا

No soul will benefit from its faith.[3]

Yes, if we were to follow in the footsteps of the Shīʿah, who disparage the Ṣaḥābah in order to spite the Ahl al-Sunnah, according to the idiom, *cutting one's nose to avoid the effect of the evil eye*, thus destroying their īmān, then, Allah forbid, we ought to have vilified the Ahl al-Bayt to spite them and render our īmān invalid as the Khawārij and Nawāṣib have done. However, it would be impossible for us to do so as we are governed by intelligence and that which has been divinely transmitted to us (*ʿaql* and *naql*). As for the Shīʿah, they have no limits and restrictions, like a stray camel wandering about aimlessly.

The two eyes of īmān

The reality is that both groups, the Ṣaḥābah and the Ahl al-Bayt, enjoy the greatest significance and importance to us and they are like two eyes for us. If we destroy any one of our eyes, it would be to our detriment only. Imagine a person who has a beautiful face and features; if one of his eyes were to be disfigured, it would make the other eye also unattractive. Similarly, if the pupil from the defective eye were to be inserted into the good eye and the white area within the normal eye were now filled with blackness, it would be so odious and dreadful that anyone who may have had any attraction to this person would cringe at the mere sight of him. The person himself would be so disturbed by this reaction that he would desire that the defective eye remain as it is without its contents being implanted into the normal eye.

1 Sūrah al-Tawbah: 20.

2 Sūrah al-Aḥzāb: 71.

3 Sūrah al-Anʿām: 158.

As absurd as this is, this seems to be the reality of the īmān of the Shīʿah. Nevertheless, reverence for the Ṣaḥābah and love for the Ahl al-Bayt are like the two eyes of īmān according to the testimony of the Qur'ān and ḥadīth (and which the reader of this book has already witnessed). As for the Shīʿah, they have disfigured one eye completely and they have placed this eye and its contents into the socket of the correct eye.

The correlation is as follows: The Shīʿah have disregarded reverence and love for the Ṣaḥābah, which is the fountainhead of īmān and they have exaggerated the veneration for the Ahl al-Bayt so much that they have dedicated the portion of reverence for the Ṣaḥābah to the Ahl al-Bayt. They did not stop at this but just as in the example, the entire portion of the whiteness was replaced with blackness only, the Shīʿah have done exactly the same.

Consequently, just as the eye comprises of a pupil and the whiteness around it, the word *ʿItrah*—which refers to the Ahl al-Bayt—refers to a few categories of relatives such as wives, offspring and kith and kin. This meaning of *ʿitrah* is unanimously agreed upon by linguists. Now consider that from the entire implication of this term, the Shīʿah merely revere twelve individuals and a few others and reject the rest. Since they declare these twelve to be their leaders, they venerate them only and assign the portion of reverence and veneration due to the rest of the members of the Ahl al-Bayt and the Ṣaḥābah to these twelve particular individuals. This explains the relation to the example cited above; whilst the normal eye has become enlarged, the whiteness has been substituted with blackness.

Nevertheless, it is necessary to elaborate and substantiate this point, lest the Shīʿah consider it an allegation and misrepresentation of the facts. They could actually consider it an allegation due to saying: "A man judges other by his own standards." They are then at liberty to verify this from their references and their scholars, and they would be left with no alternative other than attesting to the truth of what has been written here.

Honouring some of the Ahl al-Bayt and rejecting the rest

Consequently, the Shīʿah do not even consider Sayyidah Ruqayyah رضي الله عنها and Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm رضي الله عنها to be the daughters of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم. This view is so commonly heard from the Shīʿah that along with the masses, the learned

among them also claim this. The error of the learned ones is worse since authentic Shīʿī sources establish that they were indeed the daughters of the Prophet ﷺ and this has been documented earlier on.

Similarly, the Shīʿah do not include the honourable uncle of the Prophet ﷺ, Sayyidunā ʿAbbās رضي الله عنه, or his family to be among the ʿitrah of the Prophet ﷺ. The same applies to Sayyidunā Zubayr ibn al-ʿAwwām رضي الله عنه. Whilst Sayyidunā ʿAbbās enjoys a very prominent relationship and link with the Prophet ﷺ not many are aware of the close ties which Sayyidunā Zubayr رضي الله عنه enjoys. In fact, he could actually be considered a brother to the Prophet ﷺ on account of his close links and ties. Firstly, Sayyidunā Zubayr's رضي الله عنه mother is Ṣafiyyah رضي الله عنها who is the paternal aunt of the Prophet ﷺ. His paternal grandmother is Hālah bint Wahb ibn ʿAbd al-Manāf, who is the true maternal aunt of the Prophet ﷺ (his mother's sister). His father's paternal aunt is Umm Ḥabīb bint al-Asad, who is the Prophet's ﷺ paternal grandmother and his paternal aunt is Sayyidah Khadījah رضي الله عنها, who is the Prophet's ﷺ wife. In addition to this, his wife is Sayyidah Asmā', who is none other than the sister of Sayyidah ʿĀ'ishah رضي الله عنها, the wife of the Prophet ﷺ. Finally, his ancestry links up with the Prophet ﷺ at the fifth ancestor, Quṣay ibn Kilāb. Based on this, the scholars of ancestral lineage have written that no other Ṣaḥābī enjoyed closer blood ties with the Prophet ﷺ than Sayyidunā Zubayr ibn al-ʿAwwām رضي الله عنه.

Notwithstanding such close ties, the manner in which the Shīʿah conduct themselves makes apparent the enmity they truly harbour for the family of the Prophet ﷺ. Despite Sayyidunā Zubayr رضي الله عنه being one of the earliest Muslims and earliest emigrants, whose praise has been mentioned Noble Qur'ān repeatedly, the Shīʿah consider him to be among the disbelievers and hypocrites.

Who is meant by the term Ahl al-Bayt?

As for their vilification and hatred for the noble wives of the Prophet ﷺ—the Mothers of the Believers—it requires no elaboration. Such perceptions about the noble wives of the Prophet ﷺ is all the more repugnant considering that they are the actual and primary implication of the term "Ahl al-Bayt". What else would Ahl al-Bayt mean other than the household of the Prophet ﷺ or the members of his house? Even if he knows nothing else, ʿAmmār ʿAlī would certainly know that this is what Ahl al-Bayt implies.

Secondly, when this term appears in the Noble Qur'ān it appears in relation to the noble wives of the Prophet ﷺ. As for Sayyidunā ʿAlī and Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنهما, they are included by the broader connotation of the term Ahl al-Bayt, or they were included by the personal request of the Prophet ﷺ. For your satisfaction, the verse wherein this term appears will be quoted along with the context in which it appears so that both the Ahl al-Sunnah and Shīʿah will have no further misconceptions about this term. Allah سبحانه وتعالى says:

يَا نِسَاءَ النَّبِيِّ لَسْتُنَّ كَأَحَدٍ مِنَ النِّسَاءِ إِنِ اتَّقَيْتُنَّ فَلَا تَخْضَعْنَ بِالْقَوْلِ فَيَطْمَعَ الَّذِيْ فِيْ قَلْبِهِ مَرَضٌ وَقُلْنَ قَوْلًا مَعْرُوْفًا وَقَرْنَ فِيْ بُيُوْتِكُنَّ وَلَا تَبَرَّجْنَ تَبَرُّجَ الْجَاهِلِيَّةِ الْأُوْلٰى وَأَقِمْنَ الصَّلَاةَ وَآتِيْنَ الزَّكَاةَ وَأَطِعْنَ اللّٰهَ وَرَسُوْلَهُ إِنَّمَا يُرِيْدُ اللّٰهُ لِيُذْهِبَ عَنْكُمُ الرِّجْسَ أَهْلَ الْبَيْتِ وَيُطَهِّرَكُمْ تَطْهِيْرًا (٣٣) وَاذْكُرْنَ مَا يُتْلٰى فِيْ بُيُوْتِكُنَّ مِنْ آيَاتِ اللّٰهِ وَالْحِكْمَةِ إِنَّ اللّٰهَ كَانَ لَطِيْفًا خَبِيْرًا

O wives of the Prophet, you are not like anyone among women. If you fear Allah, then do not be soft in speech [to men], lest he in whose heart is disease should covet, but speak with appropriate speech. And abide in your houses and do not display yourselves as [was] the display of the former times of ignorance. And establish prayer and give zakāh and obey Allah and His Messenger. Allah intends only to remove from you the impurity [of sin], O people of the [Prophet's] household, and to purify you with [extensive] purification. And remember what is recited in your houses of the verses of Allah and wisdom. Indeed, Allah is ever Subtle and Acquainted [with all things].[1]

This is the correct translation of these verses in its context. Any Shīʿī is at liberty to refer to his scholars about the correctness of this translation. Nevertheless, the verses establish that the noble consorts of the Prophet ﷺ are the primary implication of the term "Ahl al-Bayt".

Placing the cloak around Sayyidunā ʿAlī رضي الله عنه

Consequently, the Prophet ﷺ gathered Sayyidunā ʿAlī, Sayyidah Fāṭimah, Sayyidunā Ḥasan and Ḥusayn, placed his sheet around them and supplicated thus:

1 Sūrah al-Aḥzāb: 32-34.

"O Allah, these are the members of my household." The purpose of this was to include them in the merit announced in this verse of the Noble Qur'ān.

The above is similar to the manner in which a magnanimous and appreciative king tells his minister: "I am going to allot land for the members of your household." The minister realises that this naturally includes him, his wife and sons and that it does not refer to daughters or granddaughters, as they live their own lives and are under the authority of their husbands. However, seeing the opportunity; he requests the king to confer the bounty on his daughter and son-in-law too. Now, if the king were to enquire who these people are, then considering the fact that the son-in-law and the daughter are no less in relationship to him than his own wives, he will say: "These are members of my family too." Now despite the king knowing that his son-in-law and daughter are not members of his own house, he overlooks this and allots land for them too.

Alternatively, it could be said that despite being revealed in relation to the noble wives of the Prophet ﷺ only, the term "Ahl al-Bayt" collectively refers to the noble wives of the Prophet ﷺ as well as Sayyidunā ʿAlī رضي الله عنه and his household.

This is similar to the use of the Urdu term "Delhi wālā"—which means one who lives in Delhi —it refers equally to all those who reside in Delhi. Now, if someone sees two people from Delhi and say, "These are Delhi wālā", then even the most ignorant person will not conclude that these two people are the sole residents of Delhi.

It is clear from this explanation that the Qur'ānic reference to the noble wives of the Prophet ﷺ as Ahl al-Bayt and the ḥadīth reference to the household of Sayyidunā ʿAlī رضي الله عنه by the same term is perfectly in order.

Nevertheless, despite the noble wives of the Prophet ﷺ being the actual Ahl al-Bayt and the Qur'ān being revealed to establish this along with asserting that:

وَأَزْوَاجُهُ أُمَّهَاتُهُمْ

And his wives are [in the position of] their mothers.[1]

1 Sūrah al-Aḥzāb: 6.

The Shīʿah still do not refrain from hurling abuse and vilifying them. However, if in response to the verse, *His wives are [in the position of] their mothers*, they were to reply: "They are mothers unto the believers, not unto us", then we would accept that from them, but what would their response be to the verse which classifies them as the Ahl –Bayt?

By their rejection of their status as Ahl al-Bayt the reader can gauge the sentiment which this sect has for the illustrious wives of the Prophet ﷺ.

Shīʿah have enmity for most of the progeny of Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها

Despite their claims of love for the Ahl al-Bayt, the Shīʿah bear intense hatred for most of the progeny of Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها, criticising and vilifying them. Amongst them is Zayd رحمه الله—the martyr—who is the son of Imām Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn رضي الله عنه. He was exceptionally learned, Allah fearing, and pious. He was martyred by the forces of Hishām ibn ʿAbd al-Malik.

As for his son, Yaḥyā ibn Zayd, he is branded as apostate by the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah. The same applies to Ibrāhīm and Jaʿfar, the two sons of Mūsa al-Kāẓim. As far as Jaʿfar, the Shīʿah have given him the title "The Great Liar" despite him being a pious saint and friend of Allah. Jaʿfar ibn Mūsa al-Kāẓim is the spiritual mentor or shaykh of Bāyazīd al-Busṭāmī رحمه الله.

As for Jaʿfar ibn ʿAlī, the brother of Imām Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī, the Shīʿah also refer to him as "the Great Liar". As for Ḥasan ibn Ḥasan al-Muthannā, his son—ʿAbd Allāh al-Mahḍ—and his son Muḥammad, Dhū al-Nafs al-Zakiyyah (the purified soul); they are considered to be disbelievers according to the Shīʿah. They also regard Ibrāhīm ibn ʿAbd Allāh, Zakariyyā ibn Muḥammad al-Bāqir, Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd Allāh ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn Ḥasan, Muḥammad ibn al-Qāsim ibn al-Ḥasan and Yaḥyā ibn ʿUmar (the grandson of Zayd the martyr) all to be disbelievers and apostate. In addition to this, they consider numerous members of the Ahl al-Bayt from the lineage of both Sayyidunā Ḥasan and Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رضي الله عنهما to be deviates for recognising the status and merits of Zayd رحمه الله—the martyr. A brief look at the books of History and Ancestry would prove that almost all of the Ahl al-Bayt members explicitly attested to the exalted position of Zayd رحمه الله.

The summary of this entire discussion is that they consider all the above individuals to be disbelievers and renegades, and they maintain that despite being from the

progeny of the most honoured and beloved daughter of the Prophet ﷺ they are destined for the Fire of Jahannam for eternity. This is based on their view that whoever rejects the status of one of their Imāms is a disbeliever of the same category as one who has rejected the Nubuwwah of any Prophet. Since this is the case, the position of the disbelievers is clear; they will abide in hell forever. This implies that all these illustrious members of the Ahl al-Bayt are doomed to hell forever and they will never attain salvation. Allah forbid!

(To spare themselves from the implications of this allegation) Some do say that these illustrious people will be restrained at Aʿrāf like Sayyidunā ʿAbbās رضي الله عنه, the venerable uncle of the Prophet ﷺ. Others among them maintain that they will gain deliverance from the Fire after being subjected to the most painful torment, through the intercession of their illustrious ancestors.

However, both interpretations lack substance since according to them rejecting the doctrine of Imāmah is an act of disbelief and there is no possibility of interceding for a disbeliever or him being restrained at Aʿrāf. It is unanimously agreed upon that there would be no intercession for a disbeliever and that such intercession could never be accepted. Similarly, maintaining that the disbelievers would be restrained at Aʿrāf also conflicts with the Noble Qur'ān. Allah سبحانه وتعالى says:

إِنَّ الَّذِيْنَ كَفَرُوْا وَمَاتُوْا وَهُمْ كُفَّارٌ أُولَئِكَ عَلَيْهِمْ لَعْنَةُ اللّٰهِ وَالْمَلَائِكَةِ وَالنَّاسِ أَجْمَعِيْنَ خَالِدِيْنَ فِيْهَا لَا يُخَفَّفُ عَنْهُمُ الْعَذَابُ وَلَا هُمْ يُنْظَرُوْنَ

Indeed, those who disbelieve and die while they are disbelievers - upon them will be the curse of Allah and of the angels and the people, all together, Abiding eternally therein. The punishment will not be lightened for them, nor will they be reprieved.[1]

Therefore, whilst the claim of love is so deafening, this is the reality of their relationship with the offspring and progeny of the Prophet ﷺ, his noble wives, the progeny of their Imāms and brothers of their Imāms. Consequently, there is no difference between them and the Nawāṣib. If there is any then it is the same as the difference between ten and twelve. This is because the Shīʿah maintain the status of their twelve Imāms and some of their close relatives whilst the Nawāṣib do not.

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 161.

However, their admiration and veneration of these personalities is also just a farce, since they criticise their very own Imāms and pronounce these faults openly to one and all. Some of this has already been recorded in this treatise.

The Shīʿah love for ʿAlī is worse than hatred for him

Whilst this is an appropriate juncture to elaborate on this, it is beyond the scope of this short treatise. However, I would record a few matters by way of example.

The Shīʿah have documented such fallacies regarding Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ that, Allah forbid, it depicts him as a person who was extremely immoral and a great liar. Consequently, he gave his daughter in marriage to a kāfir and for fear of his life refrained from contesting the khilāfah and drumming up support for the position which he was most eligible to. Instead, he performed ṣalāh behind those 'disbelievers' and maintained amicable ties with them for as long as they lived. When they passed away, he continued to praise them with such lofty words, a tenth of which he has not proclaimed in favour of the 'actual' believers. When this is their view about Sayyidunā ʿAlī—the father of their Imāms—then what could be expected about the rest of them? While the Khawārij and Nawāṣib revile Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, they too do not stoop to this level.

Similarly, their claim of love has another extreme as they belittle the status of all the Ambiyā' of Allah and raise the position of their Imāms. Consequently, the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah maintain that each one of the Twelve Imāms is superior to the all Ambiyā' of Allah.

However, the Noble Qur'ān repeatedly uses the terms *Iṣṭifā* and *Ijtibā* with reference to the Ambiyā' of Allah. This means that they have been selected as the best individuals of the human race and others cannot equal them. Similarly, the list of the four favoured groups in the Qur'ān commences with the Ambiyā' of Allah. This also implies that they are superior to the remaining three groups. Since it is evident that the Twelve Imāms were not Ambiyā', the Shīʿah could have placed them in any of the remaining three groups. It could have been said that they were from the category of "Ṣiddīqīn"—which is our belief as well—which would place them below the Ambiyā'.

The superiority of the Ambiyā’ over the Imāms from Shīʿī references

However, it would be foolish for us to think that the Shīʿah would accept the word of Allah. Let us instead prove them wrong using their own references so that they are compelled to confess to the truth. Shīʿī scholars have laboured at length to fabricate reports about the superiority of the Imāms but the truth will always come to the fore. Consider the following report:

روى الكليني عن هشام الأحول عن زيد بن علي: أن الأنبياء أفضل من الأئمة ، وأن من قال غير ذلك فهو ضالٌّ

> Al-Kulaynī reports on the authority of Hishām al-Aḥwal that Zayd ibn ʿAlī said that the Ambiyā’ are superior to the Imāms and whoever believes otherwise is a deviate.

Similarly, Ibn Bābuwayh documents a lengthy narration with an authentic transmission (according to the Shīʿah) in his *Kitāb al-Amālī* pertaining to the marriage of Sayyidunā ʿAlī and Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنهما. It contains the following:

عن الصادق عن آبائه عليه السلام : إن الله تعالى قال لسكّان الجنة من الملائكة وأرواح الرسل ومن فيها: ألا ، إني زوّجت أحبّ النساء إليّ من أحبّ الرجال إليّ بعد النبيين

> Imām Jaʿfar relates from his forefathers that Allah سبحانه وتعالى proclaimed to all the inmates of Paradise including the angels, the souls of the Prophets and whoever else was therein: “I have given the dearest female to me in marriage to the dearest man to me after the Ambiyā’.”

It is astounding that the Shīʿah maintain the superiority of the Imāms over the Ambiyā’ whereas these narrations clearly establish the rank of Sayyidunā ʿAlī below the rank of the Ambiyā’.

The only apparent reason for this is that they have allotted the share of love for the Ṣaḥābah as well as the share of allegiance due to most of the Ahl al-Bayt to a few individuals only. Since the love of these twelve odd personalities has been so compounded and multiplied, it has exceeded all limits. In doing so, the Shīʿah have fallen prey to the error of the Christians; they exalted the status of ʿĪsā عليه السلام to the extent of divinity.

This entire example fits perfectly with the description of the inappropriately proportioned one-eye given previously. Reflect again on a person who has a beautiful structure and form but one of his eyes have become disfigured. The defective socket and its contents are then placed where the correct eye is, enlarging it and to twice its size, filling the vacuum with blackness. In the same way, the Shīʿah have maintained love for the Ahl al-Bayt and have disassociated themselves from the Ṣaḥābah; and whilst they may maintain the love of the Ahl al-Bayt, they have blown it out of proportion. Similarly, they have selected a few of the Ahl al-Bayt and branded the rest as deviates and disbelievers. The allegiance that was due to all of them has been compounded and directed to a few personalities.

It is evident that just as an eye with such a description is most repugnant and unattractive, when one of the two, i.e. love for the Ahl-al-Bayt and veneration for the Ṣaḥābah—which are like the two eyes of īmān—exist without the other, then such īmān is also void of any attraction.

Therefore, we are certain that even the Twelve Imāms disapprove of such love and admiration. They would also wish that love for them be in due proportion so that it does not seem unsightly. Similarly, they would want the love for the Ṣaḥābah to be restored because the defect of one eye impinges on the beauty of the other eye. Thus, the beauty of Islam and īmān can only be realised by maintaining both aspects.

Rejecting the testimony of Allah and their Imāms regarding Sayyidunā Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهُ

Since the Ahl al-Sunnah consider securing the pleasure of the Ahl al-Bayt their greatest fortune, this humble servant of the Ahl al-Bayt conveys this message on their behalf to all the Shīʿah in general and to ʿAmmār ʿAlī in particular, that your extreme expression of love for the Ahl al-Bayt is unacceptable unless it is accompanied with equal admiration and veneration for the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهُمْ. Admiration and love is particularly due to his Companion of the Cave—Sayyidunā Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq—from all the Ṣaḥābah, who was the one who was given the title of a being a Ṣaḥābī by Allah himself, and this verse was discussed at length earlier. Similarly, the Imāms have testified to his exalted position of being al-Ṣiddīq and they have showered praise on him liberally. When this is the position he enjoys then vilifying him is nothing less than falsifying Allah and the Imāms. In order to

avert such an eventuality, one would have to overlook every fault and flaw of his—if any—and one would have to acknowledge that such flaws and faults are on account of one’s own short-sightedness. It is impossible for Allah and the Imāms to be in error!

Instead, we ought to believe that what appears to be flaws are actually merits even though we do not comprehend it. We ought to accept that there is every possibility of lack of comprehension, intelligence, and wisdom on our part and there is nothing strange about this. Did not Mūsa عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ, despite being endowed with the light of Prophethood and possessing perfect intelligence, not misunderstand Khiḍr’s عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ actions? Did he not consider it oppressive when he damaged the ship and took the life of a young boy whereas these actions were perfectly in order and carried out by the approval of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ? Is it not strange that he objected to Khiḍr even after being directed by Allah to accompany Khiḍr and after he was made aware of the position of Khiḍr? This entire episode appears in Sūrah al-Kahaf.

Nevertheless, when a Prophet as exalted as Mūsa عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ—who features prominently among the great Messengers and whose mention the Qur’ān is replete with—could not appreciate the reality of Khiḍr’s actions, who was not a prophet of Allah according to the majority view and far lower in rank than Mūsa عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ, then the Shīʿah who are neither Ambiyā’ of Allah nor *Awliyā’* (pious servants)—but instead are bereft of all intelligence and wisdom—should never feel worthy of objecting to Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ.

It is not farfetched for them to take objection to some of the actions of the leader of the Awliyā’ of the Ummah; instead this is what logic dictates since this Ummah is the best nation and its Awliyā’ are most superior in rank. What can be said of he who secured praise from Allah and from the Imāms as well, he will most certainly be the best of all the Awliyā’ without any doubt. Now, if the actions of one who is so exalted in stature cannot be understood even by the Imāms and is not appreciated then too it is inconsequential and irrelevant as his rank is so elevated.

Still the Shīʿah might insist that their Imāms enjoy the most superior position according to them and even if Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ is virtuous, he could never be better than them or their equal. Therefore, we would like them to first accept the testimony and tribute of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ and their illustrious Imāms regarding the merits of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ, then we will reply to this Shīʿī chain of thought.

If we were to accept that the illustrious Imāms are superior to Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه then what would be the response to those verses—which have already been recorded—in which Allah has explicitly declared the Muhājirīn to be the best of this Ummah. Similarly, what would be the response to the verses which implicitly declare Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه to be the best of them all? If these verses are incorrect according to your wrong beliefs, then it is inconsequential because Nabī Mūsa عليه السلام also objected to Khiḍr because he could not understand the reality of his actions; he therefore considered kindness to be harshness and justice to be oppression.

The incident of Nabī Mūsa and Khiḍr—An eye-opener

Nevertheless, it is a demand of faith in Allah and respect for the illustrious Imāms that the Shīʿah mistrust their own intelligence and acknowledge the position of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه—due to the testimony of Allah and the tribute of the Imāms, which is recorded in the beginning and middle of this treatise—despite your belief of him being a heretic and non-believer. They ought to have kept the incident of Sayyidunā Mūsa and Khiḍr as an example so that their flawed intellect and warped understanding could be soothed by such a precursor. This incident has been recorded for moments such as these but the Shīʿah are bent on harbouring ill-feelings for the selected servants of Allah, thereby incurring the wrath of Allah. How knowledgeable and merciful is Allah for relating this incident but it is of no purpose to them. At the least, they should have submitted to the demands of faith in Allah and respect for the illustrious Imāms, but alas!

Even if Sayyidunā Abū Bakr erred it would be converted to a virtuous deed otherwise he would not have secured the tributes of the Imāms

If the above request was too difficult for them to accept and they are bent on finding fault with Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه, then surely it is not difficult for them to understand that certain people's misdeeds would be converted to righteous deeds in the hereafter. This appears in the Qur'ān in the following verse:

إِلَّا مَنْ تَابَ وَآمَنَ وَعَمِلَ عَمَلًا صَالِحًا فَأُولَئِكَ يُبَدِّلُ اللَّهُ سَيِّئَاتِهِمْ حَسَنَاتٍ

Except for those who repent, believe and do righteous work. For them Allah will replace their evil deeds with good.[1]

1 Sūrah al-Furqān: 70.

Some Shīʿah may have reservations about this and confine this conversion of sins to those mentioned specifically in the verses before this and which were committed in the period of disbelief. Therefore, they could say that if any of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr's sins are converted to merits, it would only be those committed in the period before his reversion to Islam. As for those that were perpetrated later on, such as usurping the Fadak Estate which happened after the demise of the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, we see no reprieve for him.

The answer to this would be that only those could entertain such misgivings whose hearts are filled with doubt and bereft of conviction. Even if the conversion of sins refers specifically to those perpetrated in the period of disbelief it nonetheless establishes Allah's سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى capacity to convert sins into merits. Similarly, the sins of the era of disbelief are usually more in number and of a graver nature, and if Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى would convert these to merits then the vices perpetrated in the period of Islam are far less and relatively lighter. What difficulty could there be in their conversion to merits? In addition to this, the person in question is one who has been praised by Allah and the illustrious Imāms, so doubting such a person's īmān and virtue can only be the task of one who doubts Allah and the illustrious Imāms. Therefore, when the īmān and rectitude of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهُ is established by Allah and the Imāms then why would there be reluctance in accepting that his flaws would be converted to virtues?

Repentance from sins secures entry into Paradise

If they protest that the conversion of sins to virtues is conditional upon the person repenting and we are not certain that Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهُ repented. Firstly, if conversion of sins is conditional then so be it, but if this is viewed against the praise showered upon him by Allah and the illustrious Imāms then this surely demands that his sin has been converted to a virtue even though he did not actually repent.

Secondly, if the conversion of sins is conditional then the testimony of Allah and the illustrious Imāms provides ample evidence that he had repented before his demise. If he did not repent, then he would be deserving of criticism and scorn, not praise and compliments.

But if the Shīʿah take objection and say that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى praised him initially (and then too unknowingly) whereas these vices were perpetrated later on then

we must admit that the lord of the Shīʿah is such that he has no idea what would unfold in the future. As for our Lord, He possesses the knowledge of the unseen and all events are encompassed by His infinite knowledge of the infinite past and the perpetual future. Therefore, if according to their claim Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه was evil, he would not have received praise from Allah. What need arose for Allah to make an incorrect statement and be embarrassed before the Shīʿah?

If they do not have faith in Allah then they should at least accept the word of the illustrious Imāms, who seem to enjoy a higher position than Allah according to them. As for Allah, He is a victim of their notorious dogma, Badā', whilst the Imāms are immune from this. In addition, the Imāms have all-encompassing knowledge of the past and future. Thus, the only valid explanation for their praise of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه is that his vice has been converted to virtue.

Establishing his repentance from Shīʿī reports

If even this does not satisfy them then we have another response; Shīʿah reports attest that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه repented from the crime of usurping the Fadak Estate. Allah willing, we will produce this record shortly, which states that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr handed over Fadak to Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها. It also states that she was pleased by this gesture. Well, if this is not considered to be repentance from an error then what does repentance mean?

One whose good deeds are weightier would enter paradise

If this also does not dispel the kufr from their hearts, then we have another response. The Shīʿah would agree that after reckoning takes place on the Day of Resurrection, those whose good deeds are weightier would be admitted to Paradise and those whose bad deeds are more would be destined to enter Hell.

Just in case they have a doubt about this fact, we present a Qur'ānic verse which happens to be from the last portion of the last *Juz* of the Qur'ān. This is so because whilst they have no knowledge of the Qur'ān, they would at least be familiar with the basic recitals from the Qur'ān. Consequently, the following is from Sūrah al-Qāriʿah:

فَأَمَّا مَنْ ثَقُلَتْ مَوَازِيْنُهُ فَهُوَ فِيْ عِيْشَةٍ رَاضِيَةٍ وَأَمَّا مَنْ خَفَّتْ مَوَازِيْنُهُ فَأُمُّهُ
هَاوِيَةٌ وَمَا أَدْرَاكَ مَا هِيَهْ نَارٌ حَامِيَةٌ

> *As for one whose scales are heavy (with good deeds), he will be in a pleasant life. As for one whose scales are light, his refuge will be an abyss. And what do you know what that is? It is a fire, intensely hot.*[1]

Therefore, if one who has been praised by Allah and the illustrious Imāms is sinful in any way, he would still be entitled to Paradise if his good deeds exceed his bad deeds. Now, despite all of this if one has reservations then it is similar to the saying:

مدعی سست گواه چست

The plaintiff is confident, the evidence weak.

Or like the Arabic saying:

رضي الخصمان و ما رضي القاضي

The claimant and defendant are satisfied but the judge still harbours a grudge.

Similarly, Allah is happy with him and so too are the illustrious Imāms but the Shīʿah still have qualms about the matter.

The promises of Paradise and forgiveness for the Muhājirīn

If this still offends the Shīʿah then let us assume that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr's رضي الله عنه good deeds are not more than his evil deeds, then there is absolutely no doubt that he was from the early Muhājirīn and among the first Companions of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم, whose merits and virtue are contained in the commentary of the verse:

وَالسَّابِقُوْنَ الْأَوَّلُوْنَ مِنَ الْمُهَاجِرِيْنَ وَالْأَنْصَارِ وَالَّذِيْنَ اتَّبَعُوْهُمْ بِإِحْسَانٍ رَّضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُمْ وَرَضُوْا عَنْهُ وَأَعَدَّ لَهُمْ جَنَّاتٍ تَجْرِيْ تَحْتَهَا الْأَنْهَارُ خَالِدِيْنَ فِيْهَا أَبَدًا ۚ ذٰلِكَ الْفَوْزُ الْعَظِيْمُ

> *And the first forerunners [in the faith] among the Muhājirīn and the Anṣār and those who followed them with good conduct, Allah is pleased with them and they are pleased with Him, and He has prepared for them gardens beneath which rivers flow, wherein they will abide forever. That is the great attainment.*[2]

1 Sūrah al-Qāriʿah: 6-11.

2 Sūrah al-Tawbah: 100.

This verse states that Allah is pleased with the forerunners of the Muhājirīn and Anṣār and they are pleased with Him and He has prepared Gardens of Paradise for them. Similarly, they have been promised the forgiveness of Allah and a tremendous reward from Him. So, assuming that his sins are excessive or worse that he was a compulsive sinner and transgressor, then too he cannot be criticised because the word of Allah is true and His promise must be fulfilled. Unlike the Shīʿah whose religion is completely obscure and whose words have no value.

Nevertheless, these verses convince us that Allah is extremely pleased with Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ even if the Shīʿah are angry with him. Furthermore, their displeasure with Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ only entitles them to the displeasure of Allah and their illustrious Imāms.

It is impossible to fathom that the illustrious Imāms know that Allah's pleasure rests in a certain decision and they do not conform to it. Instead one can assert that on the basis of their nobility and purity, even if Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ had infringed on their rights in any way they would willingly forego it and approve of all his actions, simply because they know that Allah approves of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.

Similarly, there is no need for the Ahl al-Bayt to overlook his misdeeds or approve of him because if Allah is pleased with anyone, he will please all those people who have claims against him or ill-feelings for him. The Noble Qur'ān therefore says:

وَنَزَعْنَا مَا فِيْ صُدُوْرِهِمْ مِنْ غِلٍّ إِخْوَانًا عَلَى سُرُرٍ مُتَقَابِلِيْنَ

And We will remove whatever is in their breasts of resentment, [so they will be] brothers, on thrones facing each other.[1]

This establishes that such people would be united in Paradise who had previously harboured enmity or rancour towards each other. However, when Allah admits them to Paradise, He will remove these sentiments from their hearts and they would be like brothers unto each other. The same should be applicable in this context too.

Therefore, the Shīʿah are compelled to accept that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is entitled to Paradise because of the testimony of Allah and the illustrious

1 Sūrah al-Ḥijr: 47.

Imāms. As for the Ahl al-Bayt, the Sunnī and Shīʿah are unanimous about them being entitled to Paradise. However, considering their obstinacy, it would not be too farfetched to assume that the Shīʿah could actually dispute their admission to Paradise [simply because they are unhappy about their testimony in favour of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهُ]. Nevertheless, when both groups will enter paradise, their grievances would be resolved and their enmity would be history.

Nabī Mūsa عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ burning the calf was rational

If the followers of ʿAbd Allāh ibn Saba' fail to understand even after such an elaborate response and they choose to be like the Banī Isrā'īl who were swayed by one deception of Sāmirī and began worshipping the calf despite witnessing the phenomenal miracles of Nabī Mūsa عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ, as a result of which Mūsa عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ was compelled to destroy the calf—which cried out after being touched by the dust of Jibrīl عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ—so that it would bring them back to their senses and they could see that it was not an object worthy of worship. When it can be destroyed by a mere mortal how can it ever be regarded as an object of worship. In the same vein, if my elaborate arguments and evidence fails to make them understand then I should physically amputate the hands of ʿAmmār ʿAlī who can do no more than repeat the baseless allegations of the ʿAbd Allāh ibn Saba', so that it may serve as a lesson to those whom reason and logic does appeal to and display his lack of support.

Basing the allegation of usurping the Fadak Estate on the verse regarding the rights of relatives

As for the cunning manner in which ʿAmmār ʿAlī has presented his case regarding the Fadak Estate, it cannot stir the faith of those who are protected by Allah. Yes, the dim-witted, foolish followers of ʿAmmār ʿAlī—apologies if this seems offensive—do get ensnared in such traps. The details of this are as follows: In his correspondence to Mīr Nādir Shāh—which reflects no brilliance or any intelligence on his part—ʿAmmār ʿAlī states the following:

Consequently, Jalāl al-dīn al-Suyūṭī (in *al-Durr al-Manthūr*), ʿAlī Muttaqī (in *Kanz al-ʿUmmāl*), Abū ʿAlī Mawṣilī and the author of *Madārij al-Nubuwwah* and many other scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah state that when the following verse was revealed, the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ asked Jibrīl عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ, who the "Dhū al-Qurbā" refers to and what was their right:

وَآتِ ذَا الْقُرْبَىٰ حَقَّهُ

And give the relative his right.[1]

Upon which Jibrīl عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام said that the "Dhū al-Qurbā" refers to Fāṭimah, and that Fadak was her right. Consequently, the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ assigned Fadak to Fāṭimah. The reports which these scholars record establishes that the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ gave Fadak to Fāṭimah and that it belonged solely to her.

When the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ left this world and Abū Bakr succeeded him, he took Fadak away forcefully and deprived her of any rights to it. Is this not usurpation?

A historical assessment of the allegation of usurping the Fadak Estate

Now listen to our response which is presented hereunder. Firstly, did it not occur to ʿAmmār ʿAlī and his accomplices that the allegation of usurping Fadak is a rather old and worn out allegation which the Shīʿah continue to unearth from time to time. Therefore, the Fadak issue is something which the scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah have responded to with conclusive evidence and stunning responses, such that it should deter any Shīʿah from even contemplating to bring up the issue again. So, if *al-Ṣawāʿiq* is not easily found—and *al-Ṣawāʿiq* is not available in print—then surely the *Tuḥfah Ithnā ʿAshariyyah* of Shāh ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz Muḥaddith Delhwī is available. If not, then *Munāzir be Badal*—of Mawlānā Ḥaydar ʿAlī—is easily available in Lucknow. All the above have elaborate and unparalleled responses to the issue of Fadak. How inappropriate it is to repeat the allegation when the Shīʿah are mute in their response to these books? Forget feeling ashamed before Allah—if they possess such shame—do they not feel ashamed before people for repeating the issue of Fadak when they have no response to our rebuttals?

No matter how silly someone maybe, if they receive a sensible and reasonable clarification to a misconception they are silenced and leave the matter to rest. However, this is the trait of cowards who can only wag their tongues and do no more than that. Whilst there is no need for us to repeat our response, it is important to uncover the reality since ʿAmmār ʿAlī has raised the issue with the perception that it is a valid allegation against the Ahl al-Sunnah.

1 Sūrah al-Isrāʾ: 26.

The verse in question has no relevance to the issue of Fadak

ʿAmmār ʿAlī and his followers have no knowledge of the Qur'ān and they never will have knowledge of it. If anyone wishes to prove this, then they should ask him in which Juz' can the above verse be found in? Similarly, if he and the likes of him had any understanding of the Qur'ān they would not have quoted this verse regarding the Fadak Estate at all. Consequently, the above verse appears twice in the Noble Qur'ān; in Sūrah Banī Isrā'īl and in Sūrah al-Rūm and both were revealed during the Makkan period of the Prophet ﷺ life. Whilst the above fact may be common knowledge to scholars, any unlearned person may pick up any copy of the Qur'ān and confirm this status of these two chapters. If the Shīʿah do not accept this testimony for any reason and they feel that the Qur'ān would always be in favour of the Ahl al-Sunnah, then we would provide evidence to them from their resources. Consequently, al-Ṭabarsī states the following in *Majmaʿ al-Bayān*:

سورة الروم مكّية إلا قوله : فسبحان الله إلخ

> Sūrah al-Rūm is a Makkī Sūrah, with the exception of the verse: "So exalted is Allah when you reach the evening and when you reach the morning."

Consequently, when al-Ṭabarsī advocates that the Prophet ﷺ gave Fadak to Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها and he asserts that Sūrah al-Rūm is from the Makkan period, then we would like to ask him if there was any existence of Fadak at that time. The Fadak Estate only came into the Prophet's ﷺ possession six or seven years after the migration to Madīnah. Therefore, if for arguments sake any authentic Sunnī reference were to suggest that this verse was revealed after the Conquest of Khaybar, then too the Shīʿah should have rejected it, based upon what is stated by their scholars.

Thus, it is established that this is but an allegation of the Shīʿah. However, if someone were to suggest that "Makkī" also refers to a verse revealed in Makkah or in the precincts of Makkah after hijrah. Therefore, it is possible that these chapters are classified as "Makkī" on account of being revealed during the Conquest of Makkah; we would say that the background for the opening verses of Sūrah al-Rūm as well as the circumstances relating to the following verse of Sūrah Banī Isrā'īl disprove this possibility:

And do not recite (too) loudly in your prayer.[1]

In addition to this, Dildār ʿAlī's only refutation of the Ahl al-Sunnah's reference to the following verse used to prove the prohibition of Mutʿah was that it is a Makkī verse:

إِلَّا عَلَىٰ أَزْوَاجِهِمْ أَوْ مَا مَلَكَتْ أَيْمَانُهُمْ

Except from their wives or those their right hands possess.[2]

Accordingly, his refutation will only be valid if the common meaning of the terms Makkī and Madanī are implied (that Makkī refers to revelation before hijrah and Madanī refers to revelation after Hijrah]. In this case, Dildār ʿAlī concurs with our view and any other explanation by the Shīʿah has no merit.

The implications of their interpretation of the verse

Firstly, for those who insist that this is the correct meaning and interpretation of the words "Dhū al-Qurbā" and "their rights", do they not realise the implications of this interpretation. Whilst the Ahl al-Sunnah has the blessing of īmān and conviction and they are aware that the Shīʿah have fabricated this narration regarding Fadak, what about the perception that it creates for Jews, Christians and Hindus who may be conversant with Arabic, as they have no īmān and no regard for the Prophet's ﷺ honour? Are the Shīʿah not giving them the opportunity to accuse the Prophet ﷺ of hankering after worldly gains and using the reference of Jibrīl عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ conveniently and cunningly so that nobody would contest what he has acquired for his daughter?

The reality is that their interpretation has absolutely no relationship with the verse of the Noble Qur'ān. This is because al-Qurbā refers to every close relative and why should Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا be implied exclusively? The Prophet's ﷺ many close relatives include Sayyidah Ruqayyah, Sayyidah Zaynab, and Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm who are his biological daughters according to the testimony of the Qur'ān and credible Shīʿī references. Consequently, *al-Kāfī* of al-Kulaynī—the most

1 Sūrah Banī Isrā'īl: 110.

2 Sūrah al-Mu'minūn: 6.

authentic reference of the Shīʿah—affirms that they were no less than Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا in their relationship to the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. We have recorded this issue already. And if anyone were to say that their demise occurred prior to the revelation of this verse then we would refute it because they passed away in Madīnah whilst the verse is Makkī.

Secondly, we attest that Sayyidunā ʿAlī, Sayyidunā ʿAbbās, Sayyidunā Ḥasan, Sayyidunā Ḥusayn, Sayyidunā Jaʿfar, and others were alive when the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ received the Fadak Estate and it is unanimously agreed upon that all of them were the very close relatives of the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. Why then did the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ hand over Fadak to Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا only and deprive the rest of their due right? And if anyone doubts this, then we present ʿAmmār ʿAlī himself to testify to the meaning of this verse. He says: "And O Muḥammad; give your relatives their due."

The above establishes the meaning of al-Qurbā. As for confining the implication of "their right" to Fadak, it is completely baseless and meaningless. Does it not occur to them at all that whilst such flaws could certainly be attributed to them, what if this criticism actually goes against Allah and His Messenger? Perhaps these collaborators felt that if Allah and His Messenger do not conform to our views, we would attempt to force them to conform to it even against their wishes.

Thirdly, when they failed to give the Noble Qur'ān its due for being the miraculous Word of Allah and when they failed to accord due honour to the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ they committed such a foolish act and fabricated reports which lack substance even in the view of those who are not too learned, making them doubt the very eloquence and profoundness which the Qur'ān is acclaimed for. They could actually suggest that the verse be re-phrased probably in the following manner so that it be eloquent and precise:

وآت فاطمة فدك

And give Fadak to Fāṭimah.

Accusing the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ of oppressing his relatives

Fourthly, if the Fadak estate lawfully came into the possession of Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا prior to the revelation of this verse and, Allah forbid, the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ

withheld it from her, then it would be correct to refer to it with the word "Their right" which means: "That which she is entitled to and which is her right." This is because withholding that which is due to another is rightfully referred to as withholding the next person's ḥaqq. In this instance it would be justified if the word ḥaqq is used and would be understood by common sense.

Therefore, if ʿAmmār ʿAlī's interpretation were acceptable and it is assumed—despite it being impossible—that the Prophet ﷺ withheld it from her, then it implies that Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها already acquired possession of Fadak before the revelation of this verse. However, this is in conflict with the Shīʿī view as they also refute that she purchased it. As for her gaining possession of it as a gift from the Prophet ﷺ—which is their stance—then they maintain that it occurred after the revelation of this verse. Their stance on Fadak is that it was a gift that the Prophet ﷺ gave to Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها. Based on this, it is known that prior to a probable gift it is regarded as the possession of the owner until it is actually made over to the one intended to receive it. And since it is in the Prophet's ﷺ possession, it would be incorrect to interpret "Their right" to refer to the Fadak Estate. This highlights the foolishness of the one who has concocted such a report.

Khums becomes forbidden for the Banū Hāshim

Fifthly, if we were to entertain ʿAmmār ʿAlī's explanation and concede that "Dhū al-Qurbā refers to Sayyidah Fāṭimah and "their right" refers to Fadak, then what would his response be if this implies that every instance in the Qur'ān where al-Qurbā appears it refers to Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها only. If so, it means that none of the Banū Hāshim have any rights to the Khums with the exception of Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها. This is based on their interpretation of al-Qurbā and it appears in the following verse too:

وَاعْلَمُوْا أَنَّمَا غَنِمْتُمْ مِنْ شَيْءٍ فَأَنَّ لِلّٰهِ خُمُسَهُ وَلِلرَّسُوْلِ وَلِذِيْ الْقُرْبَى
وَالْيَتَامَى وَالْمَسَاكِيْنِ وَابْنِ السَّبِيْلِ

And know that anything you obtain of war booty, then indeed, for Allah is one fifth of it and for the Messenger and for his near relatives (Dhū al-Qurbā) and the orphans, the needy, and the [stranded] traveler.[1]

1 Sūrah al-Anfāl: 41.

The above distribution of the khums is ordained by Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ and the Muslims have no authority in this regard. Based on Dhū al-Qurbā referring to Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا only, would it imply that none of her descendants or none of the Banu Hāshim are entitled to it after her demise? This is in conflict with the Shīʿī view as well which stipulates that half of the khums is for the Imām of the time and the remaining should be distributed to orphans, the destitute and travellers. Their reference to the Imām refers to one of the Twelve infallible Imāms. Therefore, based on their interpretation, that which Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ received from the khums during his reign as the Khalīfah, or that which Imām al-Mahdī would take is all ḥarām and unlawful.

If any Shīʿah were to suggest that despite the khums being due to Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا exclusively, the Imāms have a share as they are her inheritors then I would say to them that is it not true that inheritors inherit according to the share allotted to them by the Noble Qur'ān. Why then is the Imām entitled to half of the khums in exclusion to the rest of the Sayyid progeny?

What about the spoils of war after the demise of Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا?

Sixthly, if we were to accept that these few individuals inherited due to being the legitimate heirs of Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا, then what about the spoils of war which were obtained during the era of Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ as well as that which would be attained in the era of Imām al-Mahdi? Surely this cannot be regarded as the property or estate of Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا since possession and ownership demands that the person be alive. What would be the relevance of Allah's words regarding the spoils of war then be if al-Qurbā refers only to Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا?

Seventhly, when Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا did not have possession of it then how did the infallible Imāms take a portion from it? Assuming that her heirs were not entitled to her share of the khums—which requires her possession over it first—but that they actually inherited her rights to the khums itself, then on what basis would the progeny of Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا inherit the rights to the khums exclusively, whereas the progenies of the orphans, travellers and destitute who lived in the era of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ are not entitled to the same? If inheriting the rights to the khums is valid for the Imāms then it should also be applicable to the progenies of the orphans and destitute as well, irrespective of their financial status since inheritance after all is not governed by a recipient's financial status.

Nonetheless, it goes without saying that the verse actually instructs the Prophet ﷺ to give all his relatives their full due and this meaning is clearly understood by anyone who has perception of the language.

Eighthly, if al-Qurbā refers to Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها and Fadak is her due, it implies that the Prophet ﷺ is absolved of his obligation to her simply by giving Fadak to her. As for the remaining wealth of the Prophet ﷺ which he received before or after that, either as khums or as Fay' (booty received through a covenant) or whatever else could be the purport of the word ḥaqq, it should then be solely for the orphans, destitute and travellers. It is evident that Fadak is not even a thousandth portion of this entire sum. Therefore, based on the Shīʿī view, Allah has been grossly unfair in this distribution as Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها simply inherits a tiny portion of her father's estate and the rest is for strangers. Is it only the Fadak Estate which Allah desired her to have?

Even if this distribution of shares seems inappropriate, the Ahl al-Sunnah have an adequate response to it because we maintain the following:

ذٰلِكَ فَضْلُ اللّٰهِ يُؤْتِيْهِ مَنْ يَّشَاءُ

That is the bounty of Allah , which He gives to whom He wills.[1]

وَاللّٰهُ يَرْزُقُ مِنْ يَشَاءُ

And Allah gives provision to whom He wills.[2]

But the Shīʿah have an issue with this distribution as they maintain that it is obligatory upon Allah to be just and fair in matters of this nature. So how tragic is it, Allah forbid, that Allah was unjust by giving less to those who were more-deserving and more to those who were less-deserving?

Ninthly, if the Shīʿah were to turn around and place the blame on the Ahl al-Sunnah by saying that ʿAmmār ʿAlī has taken this report—of the meaning of this verse—from Sunnī references and it is found in their very own books so if its implications are offensive then we are not guilty of any crime. In this case we would say to them

1 Sūrah al-Jumuʿah: 4.

2 Sūrah al-Nūr: 38.

that this report is actually reported in *Majmaʿ al-Bayān* of al-Ṭabarsī. Consequently, this report—which states that the Prophet ﷺ handed over Fadak to Sayyidah Fāṭimah upon the revelation of this verse—is transmitted from Abū Saʿīd al-Khudrī and reported by Imām al-Bāqir and Imām Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq.

Why is the Fadak narration recorded in Sunnī references?

As for this report appearing in Sunnī references, the logical response to it is as follows: This report is a pure fabrication of the Shīʿah and the discussion in the last few pages affirms this. It should also be known that the Ahl al-Sunnah are not so gullible that they cannot discern between truth and falsehood. In addition to this, most of the Sunnī scholars have memorised the Noble Qur'ān and are therefore aware of the proper context of each verse; and they are also aware of all-resembling verses relating to any particular issue. In contrast to this, the Shīʿah with their crooked minds and their inability to retain the glorious Qur'ān or understand verses in its proper context generally misconstrue the facts. It is by the grace of Allah that the Ahl al-Sunnah are immune from such folly and just as how gold and silver can be put to the test, the Ahl al-Sunnah check reports and narrations against the word of Allah, determining authentic from weak. Why then would they record such a narration which besides lacking authentic transmission and being in conflict with the context of this verse suggests through its very wording and content that it is unreliable? Instead, this is the scheming and plotting of Shīʿī scholars who thereby wish to sway simple-minded Sunnīs from the straight path.

The narration is in conflict with the context of the Qur'ān

Firstly, this narration is in conflict with the context within which this verse appears and I plead to those who have any sense of justice and impartiality to pay attention to this elaboration simply for the sake of justice. Therefore, consider the second rukūʿ of Sūrah Banī Isrā'īl which commences at

And your Lord has decreed

and continues till:

وَأٰتِ ذَا الْقُرْبَى

And give the relatives

Is the address here specific to the Prophet ﷺ or is it intended for the general Ummah? It is evident that the address is directed to the Ummah in general. This is because all the following words have the plural personal pronoun:

أَلَّا تَعْبُدُوْا

That you [plural] not worship

رَبُّكُمْ أَعْلَمُ بِمَا فِيْ نُفُوْسِكُمْ

Your Lord is most knowing of what is within yourselves

وَلَا تَقْتُلُوْا أَوْلَادَكُمْ

And do not [plural] kill your children[1]

Therefore, despite "When one of them nears old age" and "Give the Dhū al-Qurbā" appearing to be directed to the Prophet ﷺ, the reason for its singularity is simply because the Prophet ﷺ is being spoken to and because this is a continuation from "*Your Rabb has decreed*". Therefore, the reality is that despite "*Give the Dhū al-Qurbā*" appearing to be an address to the Prophet ﷺ only, "*That you not worship*" and the likes of it and the nature of these commands make it evident that it is a general address to one and all. The only difference between "*That you not worship*" and "*Give the Dhū al-Qurbā*" is that in the first case one address is directed to one and all but in the second case the address is repeated individually to each and every one to whom the address could be relevant.

If it is said that "*Give the Dhū al-Qurbā*" seems to be exclusively directed to the Prophet ﷺ, since it is connected to "*And your Lord has decreed*", then this matter needs to be referred to those who are acquainted with the science of ʿIlm al-Maʿānī, who will explain the issues relating to an *Inshā'* (a directive) being connected to a *Khabar* (a statement). Since there is no conformity between the two, it simply cannot be connected to each other. Similarly, the issue of a past-tense verb being connected

1 Sūrah Banī Isrā'īl: 23-31.

to a direct command is also not in order. Therefore, if it is connected to anything then it (*Give the Dhū al-Qurbā*) is actually connected to "*That you not worship*".

However, if it is said that "*And your Lord has decreed*" is apparently a *khabar* (information) but its implication is that of a direct command and this is based on "*That you not worship*" also being a direct command in the same passage then it would be said that just as "*That you not worship*" supports the fact that the khabar denotes a direct command, it also establishes that the command given here in these verses is all-inclusive and not exclusive.

It would then be relevant to ask why the address is not standard in the entire passage, if the address is meant for the entire Ummah? Why is a plural personal pronoun not used throughout the passage or why is the singular one not used? Therefore, it would be said that when multiple commands are being issued at once and one particular command is more prominent then the others, or when it is perceived that those who are being addressed may be complacent about a particular issue, then it demands that the address be made directly to each and every individual concerned. Consequently, since the folly of shirk and the importance of kindness to parents is logical, it was not deemed necessary to add emphasis or to warn about its importance in strong terms. However, its precedence over the rest of the commands issued thereafter does signify its added importance.

In this light, the rights of relatives are an issue which most people are complacent about. Based on this, it required added emphasis and the change of expression serves this requirement. Similarly, the command of Tawhīd and abstention from shirk directs us about our relationship with Allah. As for the remaining verses regarding the rights of others and the prohibition of extravagance and waste it highlights the manner in which we should deal with the creation of Allah. Therefore, dealings are of two types: the manner of dealing with Allah and the manner of dealing with His creation. In the same manner, commands and prohibitions are also of two types.

Since the object of these verses is to rectify dealings, and dealings occur between two parties, whereas the relationship with Allah and dealing with Him, all the creation are equal in this regard and Allah is One only; His relationship with His creation is the same. Therefore, this could be considered as one standard form of transacting. As for people dealing with people, each person is unique in this regard since every person's relatives are different and the relationship with

each one differs. Therefore, the manner in which he deals with each one of them would be different. Consider then that when the relationship with Allah is one standard relationship, then one all-inclusive address was adequate and when the relationship with individuals is multi-faceted, then the address ought to be repeated and directed to each and every individual specifically.

The address is specific but the implication is general

If somebody stills has reservations after this explanation then it would simply be on the basis of being biased and prejudiced, but this would not affect our argument in any way because even if the address in "*Give the Dhū al-Qurbā*" is directed exclusively to the Prophet ﷺ then too it would be applicable to the entire Ummah. Consider the next verse which is as follows:

إِمَّا يَبْلُغَنَّ عِندَكَ الْكِبَرَ أَحَدُهُمَا أَوْ كِلَاهُمَا فَلَا تَقُل لَّهُمَا أُفٍّ وَلَا تَنْهَرْهُمَا وَقُل لَّهُمَا قَوْلًا كَرِيمًا

Whether one or both of them reach old age [while] with you, say not to them [so much as], "uff," and do not repel them but speak to them a noble word.

The Prophet ﷺ began receiving revelation at the age of forty and he had lost both his parents by the time he was six years old. Now if this address is exclusively to the Prophet ﷺ then all that could be said is that although Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ is speaking to the Prophet ﷺ the message is actually for the entire Ummah. Therefore, the situation with "*Give the Dhū al-Qurbā*" is the same as this.

Similarly, the philosophy of directing an address to the most prominent person is to emphasise its importance to all those who are lower in rank. A king may sometime direct an address to his most important minister or officer, thereby sending a clear message of its importance to the rest of his subjects.

Therefore, "*Whether one or both of them reach old age*" establishes that even though the address is exclusive, the implication is general.

The verse that follows regarding extravagance also proves that this is not some exclusive command for the Prophet ﷺ only and that compliance is mandatory by one and all.

Similarly, this passage establishes that parents are included under "*Dhū al-Qurbā*". In fact, their rights are highly emphasised here. "*Give the Dhū al-Qurbā*" can only be regarded as an all-inclusive command if "*their rights*" denotes kindness to relatives, which is the obvious implication of this word and not the Fadak Estate. If it refers to Fadak then how could every Muslim possess a Fadak Estate to be handed over to his relatives? Therefore, the context in which this verse appears in Sūrah Banī Isrā'īl refutes the validity of that report.

The verse from Sūrah al-Rūm

The same applies to this verse in the context in which it appears in Sūrah al-Rūm. If one has to consider the verses carefully from:

أَنَّ اللّٰهَ يَبْسُطُ الرِّزْقَ

Allah extends provision

Until after:

فَأٰتِ ذَا الْقُرْبٰى حَقَّهُ

So give the relative his right,[1]

One would realize that although the address is to the Prophet ﷺ, the implication is general. Consequently, the passage commences by saying that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ grants ample provision to whomsoever He wishes and He puts whomsoever He wishes under financial constraints. Following on this, Allah then commands the Prophet ﷺ to grant the next of kin, the destitute and the travelers their due. Therefore, it is the wisdom of Allah which demands that people should experience financial constraints, thus their due must be given to them in the order in which they appear here. Allah then says that spending on these categories of people is better for those who believe in Allah and seek His pleasure, for they are the ones that will triumph. The verses that follow hereon also have a general implication. Consequently, from the manner in which "*That is best for those who desire the countenance of Allah*" has been phrased establishes that this injunction is general. If this were said to refer to the granting of Fadak, then we can make no sense of it.

---

1 Sūrah al-Rūm: 37-38.

Therefore, the Shīʿī argument regarding Fadak was based on this verse of Sūrah al-Rūm and its response has been provided.

Misinterpreting the words “their rights

If “their rights” truly refers to the Fadak Estate then there are two possibilities: either Fadak is the actual, literal meaning of the word “*ḥaqq*” or Fadak is one constituent of the comprehensive meaning of “*ḥaqq*”. This is like the case of a person having perception of a car[1], enquires about it from the next person. Incidentally a car goes by, whereupon the second person says, “This is a car.” Now it is evident that this is not a comprehensive and elaborate response. Instead, it is one example of a car so that he may have an idea of the basic composition and components of a car. Based on this, could it be possible to assume that the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ was unaware of the implications of the “*ḥaqq*” (rights) of relatives whereby Jibrīl عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ cited this example to give him an idea?

Let us refute both the above possibilities and seek a third possibility so that we may understand why Jibrīl عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ gave the response of ‘Fadak’ to the enquiry of ḥaqq? Perhaps the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ was enquiring about the quantity that is due to relatives, whereupon Jibrīl صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ offered the above response.

It is evident that all three possibilities are irrelevant and inappropriate and that the term ḥaqq is self-explanatory and requires no clarification.

As for the first possibility, who could ever claim that ḥaqq means Fadak. Considering the second possibility, it could only be the audacity of ʿAmmār ʿAlī and the likes of him to entertain the idea of the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ being unaware of the meaning of the word ḥaqq and it would be preposterous to assume that Jibrīl عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ used the example of Fadak to give him an idea of what ḥaqq could entail. As for the third possibility—that the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ was enquiring about the due portion to be given to relatives—whilst it can be a relevant possibility, it is also inadequate for a few reasons. Firstly, there is no limit to the rights of relatives and Ahl al-Sunnah and Shīʿah are unanimous on this. Secondly, if the question related to the portion due to relatives, the answer ought to have been given using fractions such as half one third, etc. Therefore, this possibility cannot be valid because the answer is not compatible with the question. If the Shīʿah accept this as the correct possibility then just as the

1 The actual example is about a horse. We have substituted it for a car.

Ghurābiyyah (an old Shīʿī sect) believed, they too ought to accept that Jibrīl عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ was actually instructed to take the revelation to ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and he conveyed it to the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ in gross error. This is because attributing this shallow response to Jibrīl عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ is similar to the other folly attributed to him by the Ghurābiyyah.

Therefore, all three possibilities are fundamentally flawed. Yes; if Fadak was in the ownership of Sayyidah Fāṭimah and the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ had taken control of it somehow, it would have been correct to interpret ḥaqq as Fadak, but what can we do if not only the Ahl al-Sunnah but the Shīʿah too reject this idea of Fadak being in her possession before the revelation of this verse. It is unanimously agreed upon that Fadak belonged to the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.

Just as these three possibilities are incorrect, the same three possibilities would be incorrect when attempting to justify the interpretation of Dhū al-Qurbā as a reference to Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا.

What about the share of the destitute and the traveller?

Similarly, if the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ was unaware of the meanings of Dhū al-Qurbā and "their rights" then the words "destitute" and "traveller" are no less obscure. Especially if the question was about quantity, then such a question is more relevant in relation to the destitute and the traveller as there is no norm in society for allotting a share to them, whereas the rights of relatives are prevalent in all cultures and societies. So why did the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ seek clarification on the quantity due to relatives but failed to enquire about the due of the destitute and traveller?

If it is conveniently stated that all these details have not been transmitted in this single report then we could accept it, but we would then ask you to produce the reports which stipulate the identities of these destitute people and travellers just as the identity of Sayyidah Fāṭimah had been stipulated. Such reports should also provide details about that which is due to them. This is because all three categories—Dhū al-Qurbā, the destitute and the traveller—feature equally in these verses as well as in the following verse of Sūrah al-Anfāl:

وَاعْلَمُوْا أَنَّمَا غَنِمْتُمْ مِنْ شَيْءٍ فَأَنَّ لِلّٰهِ خُمُسَهُ وَلِلرَّسُوْلِ وَلِذِي الْقُرْبَى
وَالْيَتَامَى وَالْمَسَاكِيْنِ وَابْنِ السَّبِيْلِ

> *And know that anything you obtain of war booty, then indeed, for Allah is one fifth of it and for the Messenger and for [his] near relatives and the orphans, the needy, and the [stranded] traveler.*[1]

If they are mentioned collectively then why was the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ not concerned about that which is due to them as he was concerned about Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهَا?

Just as aḥādīth regarding kindness to the destitute and the traveller are profusely found in the reference books of Ahl al-Sunnah and Shīʿah, the aḥādīth regarding the merits of kindness to relatives are equally profuse. Therefore, if the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ was aware of their rights in light of these aḥādīth reported from him, then he was equally aware of the rights and dues of relatives by virtue of the aḥādīth reported regarding them. If there was no need to seek elaboration regarding the destitute and traveller, there was also no need for clarification regarding relatives.

And if it is stated that the aḥādīth regarding kindness to relatives were only uttered after the revelation of these verses then the same would be said regarding the aḥādīth related to the destitute and the traveller. However, no one has a historical record of such reports.

If this is a Madanī verse it is governed by the verse of Sūrah al-Anfāl

The discussion relating to this verse thus far was based on it being a Makkī verse and this is the case as accepted by all scholars, especially Shīʿī scholars. However, ʿAmmār ʿAlī has decided to differ with this view and has classified it a Madanī verse, based on a report of Wāqidī and Bashīr ibn Walīd. If we were to accept that it is Madanī too and that it was revealed after the Conquest of Khaybar, then we would have a dispute over a particular issue. If we assume that this verse was revealed after Khaybar then there is no disagreement about the verse "*And know that anything you obtain of war booty*" being revealed before it and that all spoils of war were distributed according to the directives outlined in this verse.

If this is the case, then there was absolutely no need for the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ to seek clarification from Jibrīl عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ as "*Give the Dhū al-Qurbā their rights*" has its precedent. Similarly, the preceding revelation of the verse of Sūrah al-Anfāl demands that the

1 Sūrah al-Anfāl: 41.

Prophet ﷺ was familiar with the details relating to relatives, orphans, the destitute and the travellers.

Therefore, we have responded adequately to all possibilities regarding the narration of Fadak and for numerous factors it can be concluded that this narration is but a fabrication. The Ahl al-Sunnah have no reservations about the true nature of this narration.

As for the verse "*Give the Dhū al-Qurbā*", it is clear-cut and does not require elaboration from the likes of the Fadak narration. It simply advocates kindness and good treatment of relatives, orphans, travellers and the destitute. In the case of relatives, they enjoy rights according to the degree of closeness and love, courtesy and humility is due to all of them. Parents deserve to be honoured and served; children must be loved and reared correctly; brothers and sisters must be treated with noble character and generosity. Therefore, whilst the address is directed to the Prophet ﷺ, the implications are general and every Muslim must comply. In no way does this verse instruct the Prophet ﷺ to simply settle the issue of family rights by giving Fadak to Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها.

ʿAmmār ʿAlī—evidence of forgery and fabrication

As for a professional and academic review of this narration in order to determine its veracity, it will be discussed shortly. To begin with, there is no doubt about the falsity of this narration simply on account of the dubious ʿAmmār ʿAlī expressing that it is found in authentic Sunnī traditions. What could discredit this report more than the fact that ʿAmmār ʿAlī makes reference to it? This is because ʿAmmār ʿAlī's credibility and merit in transmitting reports is well-known. Consequently, the reality of his reports about Sayyidah Ruqayyah and Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm; the daughters of the Prophet ﷺ as well as about Umm Kulthūm—daughter of Sayyidah Fāṭimah ﷺ—has passed earlier on. His zeal and determination to defend the Shīʿī view made him discredit Shīʿī scholars and authentic Shīʿī references. His desire to establish an accusation against the Ahl al-Sunnah brought out the worst in him and if he had no fear of Allah whilst doing this, he could have at least felt ashamed of people and at least be concerned about putting his reputation at stake. But alas, the wonder of Taqiyyah, it settles both problems at once.

Nevertheless, it is necessary to highlight the status of this narration for those who are in anticipation of such clarification, so that the position of the Ahl al-Sunnah

is evident and the deviation of the Shīʿah is established. Before proceeding with that, ʿAmmār ʿAlī could have a grievance as we have disgraced him by some of these remarks, but would we ever do such a thing? Your religion is deception through and through, and if our response exposes your steadfastness upon deception then you should be thankful for that.

Six conditions for the validity and credibility of a book

Firstly, books are written by people and just as people are honest or dishonest, wise or foolish, books would also be the same. Consequently, irreligious people have authored many books, contaminated them with their poisonous ideology and they have attributed these works to men of great learning and integrity.

Similarly, many books were neither written for public review nor intended for educational benefit to the masses. Instead, they were written as personal manuscripts so that the author may review the narrations and investigate the reports thoroughly before presenting a final script. Some of these personal manuscripts were passed on to people without the due process being completed.

Other books are extremely rare and very hard to come by. They are actually considered to be lost or non-existent. It has happened that irreligious people came upon these 'lost' works and then contaminated it before presenting it to people. At times, when disputing with the Ahl al-Sunnah, they attribute reports to such works in order to silence the Ahl al-Sunnah. This has been a trick of the Shīʿah throughout the ages. It is therefore imperative for the Sunnī scholar to ascertain the narrations they quote and verify the source.

The first condition: Factual substance

Firstly, presenting facts to the reader should be the primary motive of the author rather than gathering tales and fictitious events, the purpose of which is to entertain or amuse. If leisure-reading, thrilling and amusing the reader is the objective, then these types of books ought to be in the possession of each and every person.

The second condition: Impartiality of the author

The author must not be biased to anyone nor have any prejudice. His integrity in relating events must be so evident that there should be no reason to doubt what he says or writes.

The third condition: Familiarity of the author

In addition to having integrity, credibility and truthfulness, the author must have complete or satisfactory acquaintance with the subject or branch of knowledge his book relates to. He should not be like the proverbial "*half-baked Molvī*", who is a threat to one's īmān, or the quack who poses a threat to one's life.

The fourth condition: Non-Obscurity in transmission

Along with the above conditions, the book should be renowned throughout the ages and it should be passed on to us in every generation by people who meet the above criteria. If we do not stipulate this condition, then it demands that we accept the Old and New Testament just as we accept the Qur'ān, since they are equally classified as the books of Allah. Could that ever be possible?

The fifth condition: Authenticity [in ḥadīth collections]

In the case of ḥadīth compilations, there is an added condition which is of fundamental importance; the author must undertake commitment to record only that which is authentic and genuine. This is similar to the manner in which the compilers of the six canonical collections of ḥadīth have undertaken to record only that which is legitimate and authentic. It is for this very reason that these six collections are often referred to as *Ṣiḥāḥ Sittah*.

However, if the document is but a manuscript in which the author has recorded all the records which were available to him at that time with the intention of sifting them out later and retaining only that which is highly-authentic—as Imām al-Bukhārī and Imām Muslim have done—or recording the weak and fabricated reports too along with its classification—as Imām Tirmidhī has done—but for some unforeseen circumstance he was unable to realise his objective, then such a document cannot be accepted verbatim without scrutiny.

On this basis it would not be inappropriate to say that no author has produced the final script of his work in an instant. Consequently, it is credibly reported that Imām al-Bukhārī gathered his Ṣaḥīḥ from 600 000 aḥādīth that were available to him. In fact, Ḥāfiẓ ʿAbd al-Razzāq reports that Imām al-Bukhārī compiled his manuscript for *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* three times.[1]

1 *Muqaddimah Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhari* – Maṭbaʿ Aḥmadī – Delhi.

It is therefore established that the scholars of ḥadīth had manuscripts from which their final works were prepared. Let us assume that Imām al-Bukhārī left behind his collection of 600 000 aḥādīth without having an opportunity to scan and review it, would anyone consider it reliable and valid? It is obvious that he scanned it because he did not regard all of it to be beyond a trace of doubt. When he felt this way about it, how could we compel ourselves to accept it simply because it was gathered by the leader of all scholars of ḥadīth from then till the end of time?

Therefore, if anyone comes across a ḥadīth document of this nature—irrespective of who it was gathered by—it would be common sense that such a document has no relevance if the author did not accomplish the task of gathering the authentic narrations only and/or classifying the status of the narrations.

ʿAmmār ʿAlī on the other hand—the erudite scholar of ḥadīth that he is—must be excluded from the list of those whom common sense appeals to as is clearly evident from his letter. But is not silence the best reply to a fool?

Nevertheless, this condition is of fundamental importance and many people have been deceived by reference to unauthentic works of highly-acknowledged scholars of Islam.

The sixth condition: Selecting between one of two non-reconciliatory reports

If there is serious conflict between narrations and there is no possibility of reconciliation, then preference must be given to one by assessing the narrators of each report. If preference is not given to one over the other, then the Shīʿah and Ahl al-Sunnah would both consider their collections of narrations credible and this is simply not possible. Consequently, al-Kulaynī states the Qur'ān initially comprised of 17 000 verses, all of which were removed with the exception of that which remains in the scripts of the Qur'ān today. In contrast to this, the credible Ibn Bābuwayh states that the Qur'ān is only that which is preserved till this day. Obviously both reports cannot be valid and both reports can also not be dismissed; one has to be preferred over the other.

Having established this, it must be known that the particular narration which ʿAmmār ʿAlī refers to, i.e. the Fadak report, and all other narrations supposedly from Sunnī references, which the Shīʿah use as evidence against the Ahl al-Sunnah, are not valid references. The credibility of a person is questionable if even one lie

is established against him and ʿAmmār ʿAlī's deception has been discovered and exposed repeatedly. Subsequently the readers are aware of his remarks concerning the marriage of Umm Kulthūm bint Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهَا, as well as his refutation of the biological association of Sayyidah Ruqayyah and Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm with the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. It is not necessary to repeat this as we have dealt with it more than once.

Nevertheless, ʿAmmār ʿAlī has discredited many Shīʿī reports and he has made numerous allegations in his letter to Mīr Nādir ʿAlī. In addition to this, he has audaciously undertaken to forward credible references for the contents of his letter, if and when such references may be required. Besides discrediting his own references, little does he know that the credible works of the Sunnī scholars whom he has referred to, refutes the reports which he ascribes to them. This matter will be presented shortly.

Distorting and tampering with references

Let us assume that these reports are found in some works of Sunnī scholars, then too these works are so rare and hard to find like the eggs of the Dodo bird. Forget memorising and retaining these works, the Ahl al-Sunnah have not even had the opportunity of seeing them ever. If these narrations supposedly exist in these works then just as how some Jews hypocritically adopted Christianity and then tampered with the Bible by adding that which makes no sense at all to it, a man from their progeny, ʿAbd Allāh ibn Saba', who was as crooked and deviant as them have always looked for opportunities to distort the dīn of the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and to destroy the teachings of Islam. Since the majority of the scholars of Christianity were not blessed to commit the Bible to memory and most of them were not diligent in preserving it, these distortions took root and the face of Christianity remains distorted forever.

The meticulous preservation of the resources of the Ahl al-Sunnah

The situation of the Qur'ān is distinctly different; millions of the Ahl al-Sunnah have committed each letter of the Qur'ān to memory and thousands of scholars of ḥadīth have strived diligently to protect the words and purport of the six canonical collections of ḥadīth and many other ḥadīth texts, thereby making it impossible for irreligious people to add or subtract anything from it. In fact, the abundance

of ḥuffāẓ of the Qur’ān and the multitudes of scholars of ḥadīth is a distinguishing factor and a criterion of truth and falsehood between the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Shīʿah. Based on this elaborate endeavour, it has become impossible for them to alter anything from the Qur’ān and the credible and reputable ḥadīth references throughout the ages. Despite all their attempts and wishes, the promise of Allah that states:

إِنَّا نَحْنُ نَزَّلْنَا الذِّكْرَ وَإِنَّا لَهُ لَحَافِظُوْنَ

Indeed, it is We who sent down the Qur’an and indeed, We will be its guardian.[1]

And

وَاللّٰهُ مُتِمُّ نُوْرِهِ وَلَوْ كَرِهَ الْكَافِرُوْنَ

Allah will perfect His light, although the disbelievers dislike it.[2]

Serves as a guarantee for the protection and preservation of the Qur’ān and ḥadīth.

Defeated but not deterred in any way, they then decided to tamper with unpopular and seldom heard of references of the Ahl al-Sunnah, and they have contaminated them so deceptively that let alone the laity, a few Ahl al-Sunnah scholars also fell victim to these schemes. The report of Fadak and others which ʿAmmār ʿAlī records in his letter are some examples.

However, the Ahl al-Sunnah has always found within its ranks scholars who are classified as *Muḥaqqiqīn* [erudite research scholars], may Allah reward them abundantly. They saw through the plot and by the grace and mercy of Allah, and alerted the Ummah about it. They saw the signs of falsehood and dubiousness in these reports and taught us how to distinguish between truth and falsehood. Consequently, when we read the refutation of these reports, this will become evident.

Nevertheless, the trickery of these cunning Shīʿī scholars was successful as far as these unpopular, scantly available references are concerned. This is why the scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah deal with such references in the same manner in

1 Sūrah al-Ḥijr: 9.

2 Sūrah al-Ṣaff: 8.

which a Muslim would deal with the available Old and New Testament. Accordingly, the narrations of these references are verified against the narrations which are recorded in the six canonical collections of ḥadīth, and that which conforms is readily accepted; that which is in conflict is simply rejected. Besides that which corresponds and those which conflict, the remainder of its narrations are judged against logical evidence. If it is in conflict with logical evidence, it would be rejected. If not, it is neither accepted nor rejected. Therefore, narrations which are found exclusively in these unpopular books also do not qualify for practice; instead they are neither accepted nor rejected, as is the case with reports found in the Old and New testaments.

The credibility of the author does not necessitate the credibility of the compilation

So, if the Shīʿah are not convinced about these references' lack of credibility—simply because the authors subscribe to the creed of the Ahl al-Sunnah—then the Shīʿah must also maintain that just like the Qur'ān, the Old and New Testament must also be considered authentic; simply because it is the Book of Allah too. And (based on their premise) if they do not consider the Old and New Testaments to be authentic, then (Allah forbid) it implies that they have no reliance and confidence in Allah! Well, the Shīʿah would not bother much about this grave allegation since Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى really does not enjoy any credibility in their eyes. Consequently, they have no faith in the All-Encompassing Knowledge and Decisions of Allah and this leads them to hatching the doctrine of *Badā'* (to account for lapses and mistakes). *May the curse of Allah be upon this belief.*

Nevertheless, the Ahl al-Sunnah have no conviction in the contents of those references which are unpopular and rare, especially when the enmity of the Shīʿah is taken into consideration along with the repeated instances of deception perpetrated by leading Shīʿī scholars. Therefore, these references of the Ahl al-Sunnah have been subjected to distortion just like the fate of the Old and New Testaments.

A quotation from Tuḥfah Ithnā ʿAshariyyah

If some simple-minded reader feels that I am making a baseless claim then they may believe what they prefer to believe, but they cannot hold the same view about

the great luminaries of Islam. So they should consider what Shāh ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz رحمه الله—who knows more about Shīʿah doctrine then the Shīʿah themselves—writes in the second chapter of the section on the "Deception and Schemes of the Shīʿah", in his *Tuḥfah Ithnā ʿAshariyyah*. We will reproduce the entire quotation verbatim for purposes of precision.

> The thirty-second scheme
>
> It has been a great endeavour of Shīʿī scholars to include lies and to subject the works of the Ahl al-Sunnah to distortion, especially the texts of Tafsīr and unpopular and hard-to-come-by ḥadīth references, thereby supporting the Shīʿī creed and dealing mighty blows at the roots of the Ahl al-Sunnah. Consequently, they have inserted the report relating to gifting of the Fadak Estate in some of the Tafsīr texts by recording it under the exegesis of the verse (And give the Dhū al-Qurbā their right). They record this incident as follows: When the above verse was revealed, the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم called Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها and gave Fadak over to her.
>
> But as it is commonly said that a liar has very poor memory, they failed to take note that this verse is a Makkī verse and there was no existence of the Fadak Estate in the Makkan period of the Prophet's صلى الله عليه وسلم life. Similarly, the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم ought to have made an endowment for the traveller and the destitute too, so that he would have complied with the injunction contained in this verse. Their fabricated report reflects poor forgery too since they ought to have said:
>
> وهبها فدك
>
> He gifted Fadak to her
>
> instead of
>
> أعطاها فدك
>
> He gave her Fadak
>
> Nevertheless, there are numerous examples of such distortion in the texts of Tafsīr and Sīrah, and the average—simple minded—Ahl al-Sunnah scholar is really shaken to the core when he comes across them.
>
> During the reign of Muḥammad Shāh, there were two affluent Shīʿah in Delhi. They would write beautiful scripts of the six canonical collections of ḥadīth,

> *Mishkāt* and Tafsīr books, including therein reports which support the Shīʿī creed. They would then commission lavish book-binding with gold and silver decorative work done upon the cover and then sell these books at a measly price to an unsuspecting customer.
>
> Āghā Ibrāhīm ibn ʿAlī Shāh—one of the noted Safavid rulers—employed this very same scheme in Isfahan during his era. However, his scheme did not prove to be effective because the popular references of the Ahl al-Sunnah are so easily and excessively available that such distortions cannot gain acceptance. As for unpopular references, the Ahl al-Sunnah accord no credibility to it at all. This is why (with limited exception of narrations that pertain to advices and admonitions) the Muḥaqqiqīn scholars reject any reference or citation from unpopular Ahl al-Sunnah references. In fact, they would deal with it like the scriptures of previous prophets of Allah, which cannot be used as a basis for any action or belief.

ʿAmmār ʿAlī ascribes some Shīʿī references to Ahl al-Sunnah scholars

If out of consideration for ʿAmmār ʿAlī we were to overlook this and spare him and his 'illustrious' elders from the crime of distorting Ahl al-Sunnah references it would still be of no avail. (The treachery is still glaring and evident). This is because the references which he refers to in his letter, are some which no Sunnī scholar has ever heard of, and there is reference made to some Ahl al-Sunnah scholars without anybody being able to verify their association to the Ahl al-Sunnah. Consider his reference to *Tārīkh Āl ʿAbbās*; not a single Ahl al-Sunnah scholar may have heard about it. Instead, these are those references regarding which Shāh ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّٰهُ writes:

> The twenty-first scheme
>
> They sometimes attribute a scholarly work to a scholar of the Ahl al-Sunnah and fill it with reports criticising the Ṣaḥābah as well as fabricated reports that strike at the roots of the creed of the Ahl al-Sunnah.

Therefore, if a reference of this nature really does exist (i.e. *Tārīkh Āl ʿAbbās*) then it is but the handiwork of a cunning Shīʿī scholar.

Similarly, some of the Ahl al-Sunnah references he refers to are compilations of Ahl al-Sunnah scholars who lacked proficiency in the science of ḥadīth or the

science of Tārīkh. Therefore, they were unable to distinguish and ascertain truth from falsehood. A reference of this nature is *Maʿārij al-Nubuwwah*. Yes, if he were to record a quotation from *Madārij al-Nubuwwah* instead, it would have been a different matter altogether, but what would ʿAmmār ʿAlī find of use in a reputable book such as *Madārij al-Nubuwwah*?

A word about ʿAllāmah Suyūṭī's compilations

Some of the references which ʿAmmār ʿAlī has referred to have been compiled by those who had complete proficiency and vast knowledge of ḥadīth like ʿAllāmah Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī. However, the specific compilation which he refers to is not one of those books wherein Jalāl al-Dīn undertook to gather only that which is authentic and accurate. Instead, the scholars of Islam are aware that he collected all kinds of reports therein as the name *Jamʿ al-Jawāmiʿ* itself suggests.

As for his *Tafsīr al-Durr al-Manthūr*, he gathered baseless reports therein too, with the intention of distinguishing between authentic and baseless reports. The same applies to the *Mawḍūʿāt* of Ibn al-Jawzī. Although these two compilations contain all kinds of reports, they do not appear without a classification. The very purpose for gathering and classifying these reports is to avoid a situation where some wretched deceiver, like ʿAmmār ʿAlī, may utilise such reports to misguide simple-minded Muslims. This was also the practice of the former scholars of ḥadīth like Imām Abū Dāwūd and Imām al-Tirmidhī; they classified reports and expressed the weakness contained in some.

Rare references

The balance of the 'Sunnī' references which he refers to are so rare that even if he were to claim that all Shīʿī beliefs and practices conform to its contents then too no one should be fooled by such an assertion. People of integrity have a strong conscience but does a liar have any fear? The inconsistencies and deceit in his letter is sufficient testimony to this and such deceit and is the 'honourable' tradition and legacy of his religious leaders. Consequently, Shāh ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz states the following:

> The twenty-second scheme
>
> This is the scheme of ascribing reports of criticism against the Ṣaḥābah and reports in support of Shīʿī beliefs to references of the Ahl al-Sunnah which

> are rare and non-existent, whereas those books are free of such reports. Since these references are not easily available, reference to them perturbs the common Muslim and they begin to wonder how these inconsistencies could ever be reconciled. However, there is no cause for concern because even if such reports are correctly transmitted from the said references the only need for reconciliation only occurs if the reports are of the same calibre as far as authenticity, popularity, profuse transmission and clarity of purport are concerned. When these criteria cannot be established about these unknown reports then they could not challenge reports which are authentic, well-documented, profusely transmitted and absolutely clear in purport and content.
>
> Added to this is the fact that the Shīʿah only transmit these dubious reports from unavailable references or from references the authors of which have not undertaken to submit only that which is authentic.
>
> Al-Irbilī—the Shīʿī author of *Kashf al-Ghummah*—and al-Ḥillī—author of al-Yaqīn—transmit and document a multitude of these dubious reports and then boast a false victory over the Ahl al-Sunnah. Ibn Ṭā'ūs has filled his compilation with such reports and he feels that he has established heinous allegations against the Ahl al-Sunnah.

Nevertheless, when their deceit is clearly established in many ways what can be expected about their transmission from unavailable references? Therefore, one must be convinced that there is no existence of such reports in the said references. If it were to be assumed that it is contained in these references, then it can only be a distortion perpetrated by their cunning scholars. In addition to this, many books were left in their manuscript phase without the authors having an opportunity to prepare the final edition or without them classifying each and every report and clarifying its status.

The opinion of the Muḥaddithīn about Wāqidī

ʿAmmār ʿAlī has also made reference to some books like *Tārīkh Āl ʿAbbās* which are unheard of and whose authors are unknown, and he has the audacity to say, "*like the Tārīkh Āl ʿAbbās, which is one of the reliable references of the Ahl al-Sunnah.*" In addition to this, the report from this particular reference is transmitted on the authority of the notorious Wāqidī, whose accurate reports are also viewed with

scepticism. I wish to highlight the comments of the Muḥaddithīn regarding him to put things in perspective. Consequently, *Majmaʿ al-Biḥār*, quotes Imām Nasa'ī — who is one of the compilers of the six canonical collections of ḥadīth—as saying that there are four great liars who are known for fabricating ḥadīth. These are: Ibn Abī Yaḥyā in Madīnah, Wāqidī in Baghdad, Muqātil ibn al-Yamān in Khurāsān and Muḥammad ibn Saʿīd in Syria. *Sharḥ al-Shifā'* states that there is unanimity about the unreliability of Wāqidī. It also quotes Imām Shafiʿī as saying that the compilations of Wāqidī are baseless. Now ʿAmmār ʿAlī should reflect that when *Tārīkh Āl ʿAbbās* is an unknown reference and the quotation from it is transmitted by none other than Wāqidī, then how could such facts be used as evidence against the Ahl al-Sunnah.

However, if the religion of the Ahl al-Sunnah were based on fictitious reports as the Shīʿī creed is, then there would be no harm in accepting such a fallacious report of Wāqidī from *Tārīkh Āl ʿAbbās*. Nevertheless, citing such a reference to simple-minded unwary and unlearned Sunnīs is the height of treachery, deception and shamelessness. The scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah are aware that even if such a reference exists, it must be the handiwork of some deviant Shīʿah.

ʿAmmār ʿAlī's proficiency in Islamic history

It does not seem that ʿAmmār ʿAlī has the potential to be so devious. Instead, this must be the mastery of some crooked soul, possessed by the devil. If one has to consider that ʿAmmār ʿAlī has actually attached the title of al-Rashīd to Ma'mūn, then he surely lacks the academic capability to stir such controversy.

Nevertheless, it is really despite his great proficiency that ʿAmmār ʿAlī is still confused about who actually bears the title, al-Rashīd; Is it Hārūn or Ma'mūn? You are so convinced about the Fadak Estate being unduly withheld from its rightful inheritor that it perhaps surpasses the conviction you have about the oneness of Allah and the Nubuwwah of the Prophet ﷺ. Similarly, you are so fanatical in your opposition to the Ahl al-Sunnah that you lose control of yourself.

So is there anyone to restrain ʿAmmār ʿAlī so that we could put all matters into perspective for him and there is much more which he is unaware of. Some of this is as follows:

The Fadak Estate was from Fay'

Firstly; the following verse which appears in Sūrah al-Ḥashr establishes that whether it is the question of the Fadak Estate or otherwise, all of this (booty) is unanimously classified as Fay', and the Prophet ﷺ did not have sole possession over it. Allah Taʿālā says:

مَّا أَفَاءَ اللّٰهُ عَلٰى رَسُوْلِهِ

And what Allah restored to His Messenger[1]

Therefore, it can be understood what category of *Hibah* (giving a gift) applies to the Fadak Estate if it is assumed that the narration of giving it to Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها is acceptable in the discussion relating to the inheritance of the Ambiyā'. This is a discussion on the ḥadīth:

لا نورث ما تركناه صدقة

We (the Ambiyā') are not inherited from, whatever we leave behind is charity.[2]

In fact, it would be established with certainty that the narration of giving Fadak to Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها is baseless because this narration would be in conflict with the Qur'ān. Any narration that is in conflict with the Qur'ān is unanimously baseless.

Similarly, the reliable and popular references of the Ahl al-Sunnah contain narrations which are more explicit about Fadak not being given to Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها than the dubious narrations of ʿAmmār ʿAlī from unknown sources about it being given to her. So who would be so foolish to discard authentic, transparent, and explicit narrations for the baseless fabrications recorded by ʿAmmār Ali? And who besides ʿAmmār ʿAlī could have faith in such fables?

If you are not convinced about this, consider the following authentic narrations regarding Fadak:

The history of the Fadak Estate in the first period of Islam

The following narration appears in *Mishkāt*, which is a very popular reference of the Ahl al-Sunnah. It contains a report which is transmitted by Imām Abū Dāwūd

1 Sūrah al-Ḥashr: 7.

2 *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, Ḥadīth: 6346.

on the authority of Mughīrah رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهُ. The report states that when ʿUmar ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz ibn Marwān became the khalīfah, he gathered the prominent members of the family of Marwān and made the following address to them:

إن رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم كانت له فدك فكان ينفق منها و يعود منها على صغير بني هاشم و يزوج منها أيمهم وإن فاطمة سألته أن يجعلها لها فأبى فكانت كذلك في حياة رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم حتى مضى لسبيله فلما ولي أبو بكر عمل فيها بما عمل رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم في حياته حتى مضى لسبيله فلما ولي عمر بن الخطاب عمل فيها بمثل ما عملا حتى مضى لسبيله ثم اقتطعها مروان ثم صارت لعمر بن عبد العزيز فرأيت أمرا منعه رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم فاطمة ليس لي بحق و إني أشهدكم أني رددتها على ما كانت يعني على عهد رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم و أبي بكر و عمر

> The Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ possessed Fadak. Therefrom would he spend, take care of the young of the Banū Hāshim, and get their spinsters married. Fāṭimah asked him to give it to her but he refused. It remained like this during the lifetime of the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ until he passed on.
>
> After Abū Bakr was appointed khalīfah, he administered it just as the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ administered it during his lifetime until he passed on.
>
> When ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb was appointed as khalīfah, he administered him just as they had until he passed on.
>
> Thereafter Marwan divided it. And now it has come into the possession of ʿUmar ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz. I felt that I do not have right over something the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ prevented Fāṭimah from. I therefore make you witness that I have returned it to what it was i.e. during the era of the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, Abū Bakr, and ʿUmar.[1]

This is the translation of the narration as it appears. However, someone with ʿAmmār Ali's academic credentials should not think that Marwān assumed possession of Fadak immediately after Sayyidunā ʿUmar رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهُ, as the apparent wording of this narration suggests. Rather, this is a summary of the narration and it implies that

1 *Sunan Abī Dāwūd*, Ḥadīth: 2972.

Marwān was the first person who made a change in the status of the Fadak Estate when he assumed the khilāfah. Historians are unanimous that the Sayyidunā ʿUthmān رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ also dealt with Fadak like his predecessors.

Firstly, the evidence that this narration has been shortened is found from the Arabic word *Aqṭaʿahā*. This word signifies that Marwān made it his personal possession and this could only be possible under his reign, which is apparent from the word for those who have any knowledge of Arabic. Naturally, this could only be the prerogative of the khalīfah. Secondly, if the narration must be accepted as is then it implies that Marwān assumed the post of the khalīfah immediately after Sayyidunā ʿUmar رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ and he remained in this position until he was succeeded by ʿUmar ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz. Anyone who is familiar with history knows that both of these facts are incorrect.

Nevertheless, the affairs of Fadak were then entrusted to Sayyidunā ʿUthmān رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ, where after it was overseen by Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ, which is unanimously agreed upon by Sunnī and Shīʿī scholars. When Marwān came along, he took it as his personal property and dealt with it as such. Marwān was succeeded by many Khulafā' until the matter of khilāfah came to ʿUmar ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz.

Brevity of this nature is a common occurrence and it occurs frequently in the Noble Qur'an too. Consider the stories of Sayyidunā Yūsuf عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ and Sayyidunā Mūsa عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ.

Nevertheless, the scholars, the historians, and Muḥaddithīn are unanimous that Fadak and other possessions of the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ were overseen by Sayyidunā ʿAlī and Sayyidunā ʿAbbās رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا during the reign of Sayyidunā ʿUmar رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ. Sayyidunā ʿAlī then enjoyed complete authority over it with the exclusion of ʿAbbās رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ. After the demise of Sayyidunā ʿAlī, its matter was taken over by Ḥasan رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ and then by Ḥusayn رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ. It was then overseen by Imām Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn and Ḥasan ibn Ḥasan. Finally, Zayd ibn Ḥasan—the brother of Ḥasan ibn Ḥasan—assumed control over its affairs and its returns were utilised according to them.

Having said this, it must be borne in mind that *Mishkāt* is a popular reference which is known to one and all and *Sunan Abī Dāwūd* is one of the six canonical collections of ḥadīth. When a narration is recorded in such acclaimed and authentic references then its authenticity speaks for itself. Similarly, this narration is so explicit about

Fadak remaining in the possession of the Prophet ﷺ till the end of his life and that the Prophet ﷺ withheld it from Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها despite her request for it. This is similar to the manner in which a wise doctor or nurse forbids a patient from something on account of its detriment. The Prophet's ﷺ refusal to make over Fadak to the best of the Ahl al-Bayt is of this nature. (Why would the Prophet ﷺ not withhold it from her when the actual revelation of the following verse occurred after demands for material provisions were placed upon the Prophet ﷺ:

إِنَّمَا يُرِيْدُ اللّٰهُ لِيُذْهِبَ عَنكُمُ الرِّجْسَ أَهْلَ الْبَيْتِ وَيُطَهِّرَكُمْ تَطْهِيْرًا

Allah intends only to remove from you the impurity [of sin], O people of the [Prophet's] household, and to purify you with [extensive] purification.[1]

The difference between Hibah and ʿAṭā'

Nevertheless, the above narration of *Mishkāt* clearly rejects the claim of Fadak being officially and exclusively given to Sayyidah Fāṭimah as a *Hibah* (gift). As for the Shīʿī narration which claims that it was given exclusively to her as a gift, it is not explicit in stating that it was a gift to her. This is because the Arabic term which appears in that narration, the translation of which has been provided by ʿAmmār ʿAlī is:

أعطاها

Gave to her.

The above word is general in its purport; it could refer to that which is regarded in the Sharʿī terminology as *Hibah* and it could also refer to loaning an item or giving temporary use thereof to someone. The evidence for this is that its translation in Urdu (and in English) is: to give something. Therefore, if the exclusive term of *Hibah* is not used, then concluding that Fadak was given to her cannot be established from ʿAmmār Ali's narration.

Now analyse these two reports; one appears in *Mishkāt* and the other is recorded in ʿAmmār's letter. Consider the authenticity, clarity and explicitness of the former against the weakness, ambiguity and lack of clarity of the other. Which narration

1 Sūrah al-Aḥzāb: 33.

is weightier? Even ʿAmmār ʿAlī would conclude that the worthier and more acceptable narration is that which appears in *Mishkāt*, if he were rational and he applied common sense.

If by some impossible assumption the narration of *Hibah* of Fadak does appear in the references he recorded and the integrity, credibility and scholarship of its compilers is acceptable, and the word *Aʿaṭāhā* refers to *Hibah*, then too it would be said that these compilers gathered these narrations as a rough manuscript with the intention of distinguishing and sifting that which is valid from that which is baseless. This is the case with many compilers and authors. However, they either passed on before accomplishing their objective or they did not get time to deal with it. Therefore, many fabricated Shīʿī reports appear in their works and some people falter and err on account of being unaware of the true nature of events.

A word on these baseless narrations

We are able to provide testimony about this from the writings of Shāh ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, who was the greatest scholar of his era in the field of ḥadīth. He states the following in his *Tuḥfah*:

> The author of *Jāmiʿ al-Uṣūl* says that Khaṭīb Baghdādī—one of the latter Muḥaddithīn of the Ahl al-Sunnah—gathered the 'aḥādīth' of the Shīʿah from Sharīf Murtaḍā—who is one of greatest scholars of the Shīʿah—with the intention of assessing them for any traces of veracity.

Prior to this, Shāh ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz states that when the latter scholars of ḥadīth found that their predecessors had successfully gathered all *Ṣaḥīḥ* (authentic) and *Ḥasan* (sound) aḥādīth and there was no scope for additional research on this, they decided to direct their energies to those narrations which are either classified as *Ḍaʿīf* (weak), or a fabrication, or the text and chain of transmission of the ḥadīth has been distorted. They subsequently gathered all these narrations intending to assess them thoroughly and clarify their position and perhaps sift the content which is sound and established from that which is baseless. In many instances, they either passed on before accomplishing their task or they did not have the liberty of time to do so. However, this task was undertaken by scholars of ḥadīth who succeeded them. Ibn al-Jawzī—whom ʿAmmār ʿAlī refers to as well—is one such Muḥaddith. He has distinguished that which is fabricated from that which qualifies

to be classified as *Ḥasan li Ghayrihī*[1]. ʿAllāmah Suyūṭī had the same ambition when gathering reports in his *Tafsīr*, *al-Durr al-Manthūr*, and he explicitly states this in the introduction to his work. Summarised from *Tuḥfah.*

The Shīʿah take support from reports rejected by the Muḥaddithīn

It would be evident to the reader by now that the Sunnī references which ʿAmmār refers to are no more than compilations which record unacceptable and fabricated narrations in order to highlight their actual status. Shīʿī scholars narrate these reports whereas the reality is that the compiler may have only succeeded in gathering them, not scrutinising them and clarifying their status.

However, there is reference made to books such as *al-Durr al-Manthūr* and the books of Ibn al-Jawzī. If these books do contain narrations which the Shīʿah use in their arguments against the Ahl al-Sunnah, then the appearance of these reports is just like how *Tuḥfah*, *Muntaha al-Kalām*, and *Ṣawāqiʿ*, etc. record the (false) narration of Fadak being given to Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا as Hibah. Who does not know that Tuḥfah does indeed record this narration but it classifies it as baseless at the same time.

ʿAmmār ʿAlī is very shrewd because (he records references wherein these narrations appear but he does not state that these authors actually rejected them, but) he does not make any reference to *Tuḥfah* or the compilations of Mawlānā Ḥaydar ʿAlī (who also recorded these narrations and expressed its true status). Had he recorded these books he could have scored two extra points; firstly, his list of Sunnī references (in his favour) would be lengthier and his readership are well acquainted with these two personalities. The acquaintance which people have with Shāh ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz and Mawlānā Ḥaydar ʿAlī is greater than the acquaintance with the former scholars of Islam. Similarly, it is well-known that these two scholars played a great role in combating Shīʿism. Therefore, mentioning their references would not constitute a lie and the common Muslim would really be swayed by this thinking that if an acclaimed and world-renowned scholar like Shāh ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz has recorded these narrations then they must be acceptable.

However, since the books of Mawlānā Ḥaydar ʿAlī and the *Tuḥfah* of Shāh ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz are in Persian and there are many people who are well-versed in Persian, he

1 A terminology in ḥadīth verification.

apprehended that someone may actually get hold of these books and discover the actual reality.

Shame be upon this degree of integrity. If he wished to adopt fraud and deception as a profession, he could have used this skill for trivial material gains. Why blemish Islam and disfigure the religion of Muḥammad ﷺ? However, it is good that you intended to deceive the Ahl al-Sunnah who are able to get rid of such frauds with utmost ease.

One could not predict what would be the fate of the Shīʿah if they were subjected to such fraud and deception. When their esteemed scholars cannot distinguish the reason why a particular narration appears in a particular reference—for justification or for rejection—then it is very possible that ʿAmmār ʿAlī may soon go on to say that (Allah forbid) Allah calls His Messenger a magician, one who has lost his sanity, and one who fabricates. It is not far-fetched that the blinded Shīʿah may embrace such a view not realising that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ quotes the words of the disbelievers in these instances for purposes of refuting it.

Nevertheless, no Muslim should be deceived by this shrewdness and cunningness. Many such Dajjāls have attempted to distort the true teachings of Islam and the actual beliefs of Muslims. In pretending to be learned and proficient scholars of Islam, their errors give ignorance a complete new dimension.

The reference of Al-Durr al-Manthūr

Thus far, we have briefly examined the credibility of this narration, regarding the gifting (Hibah) of the Fadak Estate to Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا, in the references recorded by ʿAmmār ʿAlī. However, it would be appropriate for us to elaborate on this issue and put the matter to rest once and for all.

However, since the reputation of the book *Al-Durr al-Manthūr* precedes itself and may leave one in doubt—let alone the common masses but even a few neophytes amidst the scholars—chiefly due to the reputation of the author, who carries the epithet of *Seal of the Muḥaddithīn and Termination of the Mufassirīn*, and his numerous literary works, particularly his completion of the famed commentary on the Qur'ān—*Tafsīr al-Jalālayn*, which has reached universal fame. Thus, I thought it only appropriate to elucidate upon the credibility of this narration in light of his own literary works (as opposed to any other).

Therefore, I commence by saying that the appearance of this narration in *Al-Durr al-Manthūr* is irrelevant because the very purpose of this collection is to distinguish between authentic and forged narrations. So, let alone this particular narration, it has a host of fabrications besides it. But credit must be given to ʿAmmār ʿAlī for his brilliance and integrity for referring to such a text to support his argument against the Ahl al-Sunnah. If this is what deductions are all about and if this is the manner of establishing facts, then tomorrow he may just end up saying that Nabī ʿĪsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ is the son of Allah because it appears as such in the Qur'ān (even if it may have been for the purpose of refuting this belief).

The explanation of Dhū al-Qurbā in Jalālayn and al-Itqān

If on account of the scarcity of *Tafsīr al-Durr al-Manthūr* one is hesitant upon accepting this, then he may refer to *Tafsīr al-Jalālayn* or *al-Itqān* which have been published and are widely available in this part of the world. *Jalālayn* is the more prominent of the two as it is a fundamental to the study of tafsīr, just as *Mīzān al-Ṣarf* is to understanding Arabic grammar and etymology. So, let us see what explanation he has given to the word Dhū al-Qurbā and Ḥaqqahu which appears in the following verse:

And give the relative his right[1]

Had the contentious narration been valid according to him, he would not have hesitated to document it and clarify its status. Assuming that brevity was the primary objective of *Jalālayn* and he could not accommodate detailed reports in it, he could at least have recorded "Fāṭimah al-Zahrā" after Dhū al-Qurbā and the word "Fadak" after Ḥaqqahu. This is also the trend in *Jalālayn* that if the explanation of any verse or word is established from a ḥadīth, brief reference is made to it in the manner described above. In fact, references to ḥadīth texts are supplied at times too.

In addition to this, it can be established from *al-Itqān* that the contentious narration is a fabrication. This is because under discussion on Makkī and Madanī chapters,

1 Sūrah al-Isrā': 26.

Ḥāfiẓ al-Suyūṭī classifies the chapters of the Qur’ān in two sections; those which are unanimously Makkī or Madanī, and those regarding which there is a difference of opinion about it being either Makkī or Madanī. As for Sūrah al-Rūm and Sūrah Banī Isrā’īl, it is unanimously agreed that they are Makkī and Ḥāfiẓ al-Suyūṭī transmits this report with some sound chains of transmission. Therefore, Ḥāfiẓ al-Suyūṭī establishes that there is no disagreement about them being Makkī.

Taking this discussion further, he then establishes which Makkī chapter has Madanī revelation and vice-versa. Once again, he establishes with sound transmission that there are no exceptions in the case of Sūrah al-Rūm and Sūrah Banī Isrā’īl; they are entirely Makkī.

Similarly, if some scholars have a different view about some of their verses being Madanī, the difference applies to verses besides the one in question. Therefore, there is no scope for contention regarding these specific verses and they are Makkī without a shadow of doubt.

We, thus, pronounce that *al-Itqān* establishes that these two chapters and the two verses in question are Makkī without any difference on this matter among the scholars throughout the ages.

It is somewhat bemusing that Shīʿī scholars are also in agreement on this fact. Consequently, we have already referred to the view of al-Ṭabarsī—author of *Majmaʿ al-Bayān*—that:

سورة الروم مكّية إلا قوله : فسبحان الله إلخ

> Sūrah al-Rūm is a Makkī Sūrah, with the exception of the verse: “So exalted is Allah when you reach the evening and when you reach the morning.”

It is thus concluded from *al-Itqān* that the following verse is Makkī:

وَأٰتِ ذَا الْقُرْبَىٰ حَقَّهُ

And give the relative his right.[1]

Therefore, it is impossible that Jibrīl عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ clarified the purport of this verse by saying that it refers to Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا and that she is the sole heir to the

1 Sūrah al-Isrā’: 26.

Fadak Estate. Such folly cannot be attributed to Jibrīl عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ. Yes, if he subscribed it to the Shīʿī faith then such a folly could occur.

Further substantiation from al-Itqān

In the 69th section—which pertains to the qualifications of a Mufassir—Imām al-Suyūṭī states the following in his discussion on differences in the commentary of a verse:

> Tafsīr [of verses or words] which is transmitted with authentic transmission are but a few. As for that which is transmitted from the Prophet صَلَّىٱللَّهُعَلَيْهِوَسَلَّمَ, it is even less.

He then commits to record all reports containing authentic tafsīr in sequence. Commencing with the first sūrah, he proceeds till the end, recording all the authentic tafsīr reports along with its references; but the contentious report neither appears in Sūrah Banī Isrā'īl nor Sūrah al-Zumar. At the end of this process he says:

> This is what is considered *Marfūʿ*[1] and which the scholars have considered to be marfūʿ. Despite it being marfūʿ, it is then either *Ṣaḥīḥ*, *Ḥasan*[2], *Ḍaʿīf*, even *Mursal*[3] and *Muʿḍal*[4] at times. However, I have refrained from that which is baseless or fabricated.

Now taking his commitment into consideration, it implies that he was fully aware of what he has recorded and what he has omitted. Therefore, if the contentious narration does not appear, it means that it has been omitted intentionally and contemplatively. Ḥāfiẓ al-Suyūṭī classified is as baseless and fabricated, and accordingly discarded it. Had he even considered it ḍaʿīf, mursal or muʿḍal, he would have recorded it, which is the case with some of those narrations.

---

1 A *marfūʿ* ḥadīth is a narration elevated to Nabī صَلَّىٱللَّهُعَلَيْهِوَسَلَّمَ. This, as opposed to a mawqūf ḥadīth, which is a narration raised to a Ṣaḥābī, and a *maqṭūʿ* ḥadīth, which is attributed to a Tābiʿī.

2 *Ḥasan* is a term describing a ḥadīth that, while not meeting the isnād requirements to be ṣaḥīḥ, did not have flaws serious enough to be considered weak or enjoyed some form of bolstering corroboration.

3 A *mursal* ḥadīth is when a transmitter cites someone or the Prophet صَلَّىٱللَّهُعَلَيْهِوَسَلَّمَ without actually having met him.

4 *Muʿḍal* (confusing/problematic) report can refer to a ḥadīth with an isnād that contains two or more missing consecutive links.

It is, thus, established that this contentious narration does not even enjoy the status of a ḍaʿīf narration in Sunnī references, nor is it transmitted with a chain that is ḍaʿīf. Therefore, saying that the Prophet ﷺ gave Fadak to Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها upon the revelation of this verse is a pure fabrication. Actually, Fadak remained in the Prophet's ﷺ possession till the end of his life, which has been established from authentic reports.

Sayyidunā ʿAlī's appointment over the Fadak Estate

If we were to overlook the issue of the validity of this narration for a moment, we have an argument in our favour—which is accepted in Shīʿī traditions too—and it relates to the manner in which Sayyidunā ʿAlī رضي الله عنه dealt with the Fadak Estate. Consequently, Sayyidunā ʿAlī رضي الله عنه did not distribute it to the heirs of Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها when he assumed control over it; instead he dealt with it in the same manner as his predecessors had dealt with it. He treaded the same course which the Prophet ﷺ, Sayyidunā Abū Bakr, Sayyidunā ʿUmar, and Sayyidunā ʿUthmān رضي الله عنهم treaded upon, by distributing its returns among the destitute, the needy and the traveller. Assuming that the portion he distributed was that which he was entitled to, the question stills begs an answer: Why did he deprive the rest of the heirs of their lawful share of it?

The Shīʿah do not deny this fact and they have given four responses to it. I wish to record their responses to this question and clarify the issue so that the folly or fairness of Shīʿī scholars may become evident to one and all.

The first Shīʿī explanation

Their first response is that the Ahl al-Bayt always refrained from taking back that which was usurped from them. Consequently, the Prophet ﷺ did not assume possession of the home he left behind in Makkah after the polytheists took possession of it even after Makkah was conquered.

Our response

Firstly, it is difficult to establish the Prophet's ﷺ sole ownership over that house because his father passed away in the lifetime of his grandfather. Secondly, did the Prophet ﷺ inherit anything from his father? If it is said that Sayyidunā ʿAlī رضي الله عنه did not resume possession of his home, it could be acceptable.

If we accept that the Prophet ﷺ did own the home because ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib bequeathed it to him, then we agree that the Prophet ﷺ did not take possession of it again after Makkah was conquered. But how can the Shīʿah establish the reason which they have offered as the actual reason why the Prophet ﷺ did not take it back? Consequently, there could be many reasons for not taking it back one of which is that one often forgives the thief or usurper for taking one's possessions. And forgiving the thief or usurper is only possible if one has the ability to reclaim possession. If one is unable to retrieve possession, then there is no meaning of forgiveness.

If what the Shīʿah say is valid then it was not permissible for Sayyidunā ʿAlī رضي الله عنه to assume possession of his share of Fadak as the Ahl al-Bayt do not take back what was usurped from them. And if he did not assume possession of it on account of forgiving the usurpers, then he was only entitled to forgive them for taking his share, but he had no right over the shares of Sayyidunā Ḥasan and Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رضي الله عنهما and their sisters رضي الله عنها. And if the Ahl al-Bayt forgave the usurper then it implies that Fadak should have been left with those who usurped it and it would have remained in the custody of the usurpers' inheritors; it was not supposed to come back into the possession of Sayyidunā ʿAlī رضي الله عنه.

The second possibility—which is the correct interpretation in this is case—is that when the enemy [disbelievers] gain dominance and authority over Muslims lands and there is none to challenge them regarding the rights of previously owned Muslim land or property, then such authority becomes lawful and legitimate for them. Since they have wrested control from the Muslims, they may now dispose those valuables as they please and they enjoy the right to do so. If they sell those possessions to someone, the purchaser secures lawful possession of it. This law has to be applied and understood in this manner otherwise the human race will be subjected to immense difficulty and everybody would then be branded as consumers of ḥarām.

International trade is inevitable and countries are dependent upon one another. If the disbelievers establish rule over a region, they would assume authority of its resources and their trade in those commodities would be legalised. If not, everybody's possession over these materials becomes dubious, questionable and contaminated. Therefore, Islam upholds this law in this situation.

The ʿUlamā’ find the basis for this law in the noble Qur’ān too and the Prophet’s ﷺ abstention from assuming possession over his home is based on this interpretation. However, if not assuming possession was on the basis of discarding possession of that which had been usurped, then this would be incorrect by the testimony of ʿAmmār ʿAlī and all the Shīʿah. Consequently, ʿAmmār’s letter expressly states that Sayyidunā ʿAlī and Sayyidunā ʿAbbās رضي الله عنهما laid claim to Fadak during the reign of Sayyidunā ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه and even during the reign of Sayyidunā ʿUmar رضي الله عنه. So, if the Ahl al-Bayt do not reclaim that which was usurped then why did Sayyidunā ʿAlī رضي الله عنه claim it?

If they say that their claim to it is only recorded in Sunnī traditions and there is no justification of this claim in Shīʿī tradition, then we would say to them the Shīʿah cannot dispute that when Sayyidunā Abū Bakr ‘usurped’ it and rejected Fāṭimah’s رضي الله عنها claim that it was given to her in the Prophet’s ﷺ lifetime then she re-claimed it as her inheritance. Once again, if the Ahl al-Bayt do not re-claim what was usurped from them then why did Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها do so?

If (being left dumbfounded by this) the Shīʿah irrationally assert that though these seem like two separate claims (the claim of it being given to her and the claim of it being her inheritance) it is actually one claim because it is *muttasil bi-lā faṣl*[1]. And since Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه refused to hand it over to her, it is established that it was usurped. However, it was not usurped when she laid claim to it initially. The usurpation only materialises after he refused to hand it to her.

We would respond by ignoring these silly statements and this would be a gesture of mercy from us. The fact that Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها claimed it from him establishes that it was already usurped. It also establishes that their remark about the Ahl al-Bayt relinquishing ownership of that which was wrongfully taken from them is a fallacy.

However, since the level of their intelligence is evident, we would deal with this false notion by stating the following: Imām Muḥammad al-Bāqir رحمه الله assumed the rights to the Fadak Estate during the reign of ʿUmar ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz. It remained in his control until the ʿAbbāsid Khulafā’ took control of it. Later in the year 22 A.H, Ma’mūn ʿAbbāsī wrote a letter to his governor, Qutham ibn Jaʿfar, that the Fadak Estate should be made over to the progeny of Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها. It was

1 Occurring immediately in succession.

thus handed over to Imām ʿAlī al-Riḍā’. Mutawakkil—the ʿAbbāsid khalīfah—then took control of it once again thereafter. Khalīfah Muʿtaḍid restored it once again during his reign. This report on the Fadak Estate has been documented in *Majālis al-Mu’minīn* of Qāḍī Nūr Allāh, the Shīʿī scholar. Had it been written by any Sunnī scholar it would have had no credibility.

Let us dismiss this report from *Majālis al-Mu’minīn* for a moment because scholars are aware of the reality of this book and let us look at this fallacy from another perspective. Consider that Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ accepted the post of the khalīfah after the martyrdom of Sayyidunā ʿUthmān رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ, whereas the post of khilāfah was something that he was legitimately entitled to and it was snatched from him by the first three Khulafā’; why did he take back that which was snatched from him? Similarly, why was Imām Ḥusayn رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ desirous of wresting control over the khilāfah from Yazīd (if the Ahl al-Bayt relinquishes rights over that which was wrongfully taken from them?) In fact, his endeavours for it led to his death.

If none of the above events (which establish the falsity of the Shīʿī claim) occurred then too there is no dispute among those who have knowledge about the permissibility of taking back what was wrongfully snatched from one, as well as the obligation upon one and all to help restore the rights of the actual owner to what was usurped from him. Consequently, if the verse, “*Give the Dhū al-Qurbā their right,*” is a direct address to the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ regarding the rights of his relatives specifically, then restoring their rights is an obligation which rests upon all those in authority. In addition to this, the Qur’ānic injunctions regarding justice and fairness are recorded repeatedly. Therefore, if the actual owner’s rights are still established in that which was snatched from him then it was obligatory upon Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ to give the heirs of Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا their dues when he assumed control of Fadak. But if they relinquish their rights and wilfully give up possession of that which was usurped from them then why is there all this criticism against Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ?

The second Shīʿī explanation

A second explanation—given by Shīʿī scholars—for Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ not assuming authoritative control over Fadak is that he opted to follow the course taken by Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا in this matter. Therefore, he did not enjoy any benefits from it just as she did not benefit from it.

Our response

What a marvellous explanation from the Shīʿah! One cannot fail to be bemused by such cunningness. Nevertheless, it is such a flimsy response that the response to it is self-explanatory to those who have understanding. One's intelligence digests this response just as how the stomach was to inevitably digest a fly if circumstances warranted that.

However, since everyone is not on the same level of understanding we would say that why did the subsequent Imāms assume authoritative control over Fadak later on, as Qāḍī Nūr Allāh has clearly expressed? Why did they not follow in the blessed footsteps of Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها or even Sayyidunā ʿAlī رضي الله عنه for that matter? Similarly, was it incumbent or optional for them to follow Sayyidunā ʿAlī and Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها? If it was incumbent then why did the remaining Imāms not comply? If it was optional then—them being such glorious Imāms of the Ahl al-Bayt—it begs the question why they discarded such a meritorious optional deed which was not only the precedent set by Sayyidah Fāṭimah and Sayyidunā ʿAlī رضي الله عنهما, but also by Sayyidunā Ḥasan, Sayyidunā Ḥusayn, Imām Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn رضي الله عنهم? Consequently, Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها found herself in a position where she could not benefit from Fadak, which was also the situation of the above-mentioned personalities.

Secondly, we respond to this explanation by asking why did Sayyidunā ʿAlī رضي الله عنه neglect his obligations to the remaining heirs of Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها if he so ceremoniously opted to tread on the path she went on in the case of Fadak?

Thirdly, *Iqtidā'*—which refers to following someone—applies only in that which they did by choice and free will. In no way does it govern such actions of the one who is followed which were carried out against their will, or in which they were victims of circumstances. If so, it would compel Imām al-Mahdī to adopt the ominous Taqiyyah which his predecessors were compelled to adopt due to the circumstances they found themselves in. Similarly, it would have obligated Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رضي الله عنه to follow Sayyidunā ʿAlī (and adopt Taqiyyah instead of sacrificing his life).

Therefore, if Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها was unable to benefit from Fadak, it was due to the circumstance she found herself in. It is baseless if Sayyidunā ʿAlī رضي الله عنه fails to exert his authority during his reign as the khalīfah and instead opt to follow her. He may be justified in relinquishing his rights but what about negligence and

failure to hand over the inheritance of Sayyidunā Ḥasan, Sayyidunā Ḥusayn, and their sister رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ?

The third Shīʿī explanation

A third explanation provided by Shīʿī scholars is that Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ did not derive any benefit from Fadak simply to prove and establish that his testimony in this regard was purely for the sake of Allah; not for any personal gain.

Our response

This response also lacks substance like those preceding it. Those who allegedly doubted the integrity of Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ in this matter were the very same people who rejected his evidence and they had already left this world when he assumed the role of the khalīfah. Making a statement in this manner after their demise lacks sense and sensibility. It certainly would not leave any impression upon the dead since they cannot witness it. Similarly, their deaths would have already unveiled the reality of their stance upon them and they would have known conclusively that they were the oppressors and ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was innocent. Therefore, failing to benefit from Fadak was pointless; Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ discarded lawful wealth and did not benefit from it by utilising it either for worldly causes or acquiring the rewards of the hereafter.

It could rightly be said that whilst the first three Khulafā' were no longer alive, their sympathisers were still in large numbers, not forgetting the Nawāṣib—the enemies of Sayyidunā ʿAlī. The answer to this is that this very suspicion against Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ for his testimony recurs when some of his descendants assumed control over Fadak later on, and more specifically in the era of Ma'mūn—who was sympathetic to the Shīʿī cause and who handed over Fadak to Imām ʿAlī al-Riḍā, as he maintained that they enjoyed sole rights over Fadak.

Would not his descendants assuming control over it stir the same sentiments within the Nawāṣib? After all, ancestors are known for having long-term ambitions for their progenies and for striving to secure their prosperity. The notorious Nawāṣib—in judging others by their own standards—would inevitably suspect Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ of impure intentions for his testimony. Perhaps he realised that he would not have control over Fadak but his testimony could bear fruits someday for his progeny.

Therefore, if Sayyidunā ʿAlī رضي الله عنه was prompted by the desire to avert suspicion and misconduct, then he ought to have made a bequest to his progeny to also refrain from profiting from Fadak, lest it gives reasons for some to cast aspersions against his character.

The fourth Shīʿī explanation

The fourth explanation is that Sayyidunā ʿAlī رضي الله عنه was adopting Taqiyyah by not assuming control over Fadak.

Our response

Since every ploy has failed, they have inevitable resorted to their devious tenet of Taqiyyah. However, it is commonly said that a liar has a very poor memory. Consequently, they have forgotten that when the Imām is equipped, prepared, and occupied with jihād then Taqiyyah becomes ḥarām upon him. This is the reason why Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رضي الله عنه did not adopt Taqiyyah at all. Therefore, if Sayyidunā ʿAlī رضي الله عنه adopted Taqiyyah during his reign as the khalīfah, then he has perpetrated a ḥarām act.

A wise enemy is better than a foolish friend.

It seems that in trying to rescue Sayyidunā ʿAlī رضي الله عنه, they have implicated him further.

To answer this, we ask: who was he adopting Taqiyyah from? If it is the three Khulafā', then they were no longer on the scene and even a coward does not fear his dead enemy let alone ʿAlī —the Lion of Allah.

If he was adopting Taqiyyah—and sparing his life—from the rest of the people, then they also fall in one of two categories. The first group comprises of his supporters and his army whilst the rest of his subjects fall in the second category. If Sayyidunā ʿAlī رضي الله عنه faced such a threat from his subjects then such confrontation could only come from the less-fortunate and under-privileged class, which compromises of the poor, the destitute, and the travellers. So, adopting Taqiyyah out of fear for them is also the lowest form of cowardice. Who else would have any motivation for challenging Sayyidunā ʿAlī رضي الله عنه whilst in his role as the khalīfah over Fadak?

Assuming that the threat of confrontation was genuine, who are the ones who had the valour and bravery of Sayyidunā ʿAlī رضي الله عنه and a formidable army to achieve

this end? The only possible suspects could be Sayyidunā Muʿāwiyah or Sayyidah ʿĀ’ishah رضي الله عنهما. Did they not attempt and fail? Even if his taking control over Fadak led to any such uprising or revolt, its implications would be minimal. Such attempts seldom bear fruit.

Consider the situation of Sayyidunā ʿAlī رضي الله عنه against the backdrop of the situation that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه faced. When he assumed the khilāfah, it was only the Arabian Peninsula that was under the sway of Islam and the departure of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم led to an immediate revolt from multiple quarters at the same time. Besides being left only with the people of Makkah and Madinah at his side, a substantial chunk of the fighting force had been despatched on a mission with Usāmah ibn Zayd رضي الله عنه. But Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه was fearless. When some of the Ṣaḥābah were apprehensive of confronting the rejecters of zakāh, he said:

> By the oath of Allah, if they withhold from me even a rope which they used discharge as zakāh I will wage war against them.

In fact, he also said that he would face them all by himself if no one supported his decision. When Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه was prepared to wage war all by himself at such a critical juncture for them withholding something as trivial as a rope, then Sayyidunā ʿAlī رضي الله عنه was most renowned for his valour and bravery. In addition to this, he had a formidable army comprising many villains who had successfully brought down an established regime. Similarly, whilst Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه was prepared to wage war for a trivial rejection—a rope—ʿAlī رضي الله عنه would have been fighting for the prized Fadak, which was also oppressively withheld from the innocent Ahl al-Bayt, so what prevented him from taking control and instead opted for Taqiyyah?

Nevertheless, the futility and baselessness of their arguments is evident. They have failed miserably to support their stance. If anything, it has strengthened the stance of the Ahl al-Sunnah, who maintain that he did not assume control over Fadak and retained its previous status. This is simply because the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم did not give Fadak to anyone and because the estate of the Ambiyā’ cannot be inherited. Allah willing, this matter—the estate of the Ambiyā’—will be elaborated upon soon.

Therefore, now that we have established our stance, it becomes evident to one and all that the contentious narration, which is the very basis of their belief of Fadak being usurped, lacks all credibility. It is nothing but a fabrication, concocted by Shīʿī

scholars. It is merely a farce, failing the requirements for credible transmission (*riwāyah*) and objectionable in content, thereby failing the requirements of dirāyah.

The same applies for the fancy fairy-tale type report regarding Ma'mūn ʿAbbāsī gathering two hundred scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah after the progeny of Ḥasanayn[1] laid claims to Fadak. If this report is not entirely false, then it is also not entirely accurate. There is evidence that Ma'mūn did hand over Fadak to the illustrious progeny of Ḥasanayn on account of his sympathy to Shīʿī tenets.

Nevertheless, since these tales are established fallacies it becomes clear that the allegation of usurping Fadak after it was gifted to Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها, and which ʿAmmār has been vociferously alleging is nothing more than a figment of his imagination. It is not necessary for us to prove its baselessness any longer. This much is conclusive evidence and Shīʿī scholars are deafeningly silent in their response to this.

Does the narration of Sayyidah Fāṭimah claiming Fadak was gifted to her occur in Sunnī traditions?

However, according to the principles of debate, taking the challenge of responding to something that is not necessary is recognised as a sign of one's authenticity and it further justifies one's stance. Consequently, the narration that Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها claimed Fadak was gifted to her does not even appear with a weak chain of transmission in the reliable references of the Ahl al-Sunnah. This narration alleges that she did lay claim to it, whereupon Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه requested her to provide witnesses to support her claim. She subsequently presented Sayyidunā ʿAlī and Umm Ayman, or Sayyidunā Ḥasan and Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رضي الله عنهم—according to the different versions—but Sayyidunā Abū Bakr rejected the claim since the testimonies were inadequate, as the minimum requirement is one male and two females.

This entire report is a fabrication of the 'learned' Shīʿī scholars, and in fabricating this report they have made themselves eligible to enter the fire of Jahannam and dwell in doom forever. What audacity! Having forged the narration, they present it as evidence and demand answers from the Ahl al-Sunnah for its contents.

---

1 Sayyidunā Ḥasan and Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رضي الله عنهما.

We would like to bring it to the attention of the sincere Muslim that it has never been a trait of the scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah to resort to lies and Taqiyyah in order to avoid a sticky situation. If Sunnī scholars had access to the backdoor of Taqiyyah, they would have avoided many problems. However, they chose to report everything and narrate the facts as they are. This is why Sunnī references quote the incident when Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها requested inheritance and Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه declined (and this much of the report is valid). They also record the *Incident of Qirṭās* and the Battle of Jamal, as these are realities which cannot be wished away. If lying was permissible, then they could have also refuted their authentic narrations just as Shīʿī scholars often tend to do.

Despite this integrity, look at the level to which Shīʿī scholars have stooped, simply because of their enmity for the Ahl al-Sunnah, and due to their jealousy for the pristine pure dīn that the we have. Subsequently, they forged narrations and made these fabrications the basis of contention between the Ahl al-Sunnah and Shīʿah. Surely lying and deceit is so inherent within them that it can only be lies and forgeries which give them satisfaction, and since this is their devious nature—just to please them—we will also say that sure, whatever they say is true and correct.

Two evidences establishing the baselessness of the report of gifting Fadak to Sayyidah Fāṭimah

Out of consideration for the people of truth, I would record two evidences establishing that their report is incorrect, so that they can be completely convinced and have no reservations. One evidence would be from the Ahl- al-Sunnah and the other from the Shīʿah. The evidence of the Ahl al-Sunnah is the report from *Mishkāt*—which has been cited earlier on—which records that ʿUmar ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz رحمه الله dealt with Fadak as his predecessors had dealt with it.

We have highlighted the authenticity and veracity of this report earlier on. *Mishkāt* is a renowned book of ḥadīth and this particular narration is recorded therein from *Sunan Abī Dāwūd*, one of the six canonical collections of ḥadīth.

Nevertheless, this is an authentic narration in Sunnī references. Therefore, any report in conflict with it, especially when its chain of transmission and its reference falls well below the standard of the report contained in *Sunan Abī Dāwūd*, cannot be considered true and accurate.

Therefore, if anyone goes on to claim that Sunnī references contain the narration of Fadak being gifted to Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا, then every Muslim should know that this is a false allegation. And if it does appear in any Sunnī resource, it appears for the sake of refuting its validity and dismissing it as inaccurate. Or perhaps it was added to that reference by mischief makers, or the author collected all types of reports with the intention of scanning and assessing them but he could not accomplish his goal and the task was left incomplete. Shīʿī scholars then cunningly sourced the narration from the Sunnī reference and use it as evidence.

The second evidence is from the Shīʿah, which would further implicate them and silence them, which is the fact that Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ also retained Fadak as it was previously, by distributing its benefits to the poor, the destitute and the travellers. Similarly, he neither benefited from it personally nor distributed the legitimate shares of the Ahl al-Bayt, whom the Shīʿah revere so highly. The Shīʿah cannot deny the reality that Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ dealt with Fadak in this manner and we have already elaborated on this. Though they have strived to challenge this, they have failed miserably. This fact remains uncontested and both sides have no option but to accept it and this along with the narration of *Mishkāt* adequately establishes that the narration that Fadak was given to Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا is invalid.

When there is no basis to this report then why did they go on to say that Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا—the infallible daughter of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ according to them but rather protected according the Ahl al-Sunnah—went on to make false claims and also made Sayyidunā ʿAlī and Ḥasan and Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ give blatantly false testimony, which is akin to disbelief.

Nevertheless, this narration finds no expression in Sunnī references, it is a fabrication of the Shīʿah. It is then the high of folly and stupidity to make their own fabrication a point of contention between us and them and seek clarification or demand an explanation from us.

As for the remaining nine or ten references ʿAmmār ʿAlī records, it is nothing more than an old trick which has been transmitted to him from heart to heart by his predecessors. We have given the response to this quoting from *Tuḥfah* of Shah ʿAbd al ʿAzīz that Shīʿī scholars trick people by making reference to rare books, the names of which are unfamiliar, and then alleging that these reports are to be found in them. However, these books are free of such reports and if one or two odd

manuscripts of these rare books contain such a report, then these manuscripts have been forged by their scholars. *Tuḥfah* has highlighted this scheme in detail.

But if all the manuscripts of a rare book concur in relation to such a report then it must be determined whether the author set out to record authentic reports only or was it his aim to gather all reports randomly. Consequently, the latter is true. Accordingly, in his treatise on the principles of ḥadīth, Shah ʿAbd al-Ḥaqq has written that Imām Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī has collected narrations from approximately fifty books in his *Jamʿ al-Jawāmiʿ*, and he has recorded all narrations therein irrespective of its classification as ṣaḥīḥ, ḍaʿīf or ḥasan. This is the case with other references and authors too.

Since the objective was collecting reports in general these books have not been given the prominence which authentic books enjoy. Had the compilers intended to put forth authentic transmissions only, their works would have been recognised as the authentic works are recognised.

Even if we assume that these compilers intended to collect authentic narrations only, then too the classification of the status of a ḥadīth does not depend entirely on the views of one scholar only, according to the academic traditions of the Ahl al-Sunnah. In matters of this nature, whilst it is not necessary that the Muḥaddithīn would have unanimity on the issue, but a significant majority of ḥadīth experts being in agreement on its classification is vital. Anyone can understand that this process of clarification and authorisation is vital.

In addition to this, many Shīʿī scholars hid under the cloak of Taqiyyah and then went on to gain the confidence of people after spending considerable time with Sunnī Muḥaddithīn. They then narrated the aḥādīth of those scholars and also transmitted their fabrications through the same chain of transmission. Since they seemed noble and righteous outwardly and they had recourse to Taqiyyah, they succeeded in transmitting their fictitious reports through established lines of transmission. Many simple-minded, albeit credible scholars, accepted their narrations on the basis of harbouring good thoughts for fellow Muslims and since they seemed righteous and they were transmitting these ‘facts’ from credible teachers. Thus, they were deceived.

The greatest treachery of the Shīʿah under the guise of Taqiyyah

However, the scholars who came later on realised this trick and unveiled the masked villains and declared their transmissions to be fabrications. Consequently, Shah ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz states the following in *Tuḥfah*, whilst dealing with the cunningness of the Shīʿah:

> The fifteenth ploy is that a group amongst the Shīʿī scholars impersonated Sunnī scholars of ḥadīth and dedicated themselves to ḥadīth acquisition. They attended the gatherings of credible Muḥaddithīn and captured their respective credible chains of transmission. They then adopted the ways of the righteous and pious ones thereby winning the confidence of the next generation of ḥadīth seekers. They then transmitted their valid narrations and succeeded in transmitting their distortions too.
>
> This treachery of the Shīʿī scholars beguiled many scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah. What could be said about the general masses then. This is because the capacity to distinguish between a ṣaḥīḥ ḥadīth and concocted narrations is the specialised field of those who have mastery over the science of isnād. Since this treachery was a breach which surpassed the chain of transmission, the scope for detection was dramatically reduced, if not lost all together.
>
> However, since the knowledge of the Ahl al-Sunnah has been assured divine protection, the scholars of isnād were alerted at once and they discovered it and exposed it for what it really was. Subsequently, when the matter was resolved then Shīʿī scholars acknowledged committing these forgeries.
>
> Some of them denied the allegation but there is a certain common feature in these narrations by which they can be sniffed out. These narrations are preserved to this day in the various *Maʿājim*, *Muṣannafāt*, and *Ajzā’*. Most of those who maintain that ʿAlī was superior—to all three Khulafā’ or to ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ only, i.e. Tafḍīliyyah—as well as those who have Shīʿī inclinations tend to take support from these particular narrations.
>
> The first person who was found guilty of this offence was Jābir al-Juʿfī. When he was exposed, Imām al-Bukhārī and Imām Muslim declared him unworthy and rejected all narrations from him as a precaution. Imām al-Tirmidhī, al-Nasa’ī, and Abū Dāwūd accepted those of his narrations wherein some other credible narrator corroborated what he had transmitted. As for the rest of these narrations, they were discarded.

> Abū al-Qāsim Saʿd ibn ʿAbd Allāh Ubayy ibn Khalf al-Qummī was another notorious character, skilled at the art of distortion. Many of those who lack insight into the science of isnād consider him to be one of our credible transmitters of ḥadīth, which is incorrect. Al-Najāshī—an authority of Shīʿī reporters—states that this person is the pride of Shīʿī scholars and their most prominent jurist and scholar.

The above exposition by Shah ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz is worth its weight in gold. His proficiency in knowledge and in history is uncontested by both sides. Let alone his proficiency and distinction as a Sunnī scholar, he enjoys unparalleled insight about Shīʿism, which even Shīʿī scholars were envious of. *Tuḥfah Ithnā ʿAshariyyah* is glowing evidence of this.

Even if these words were not from Shah ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz and it were said by someone else, then too it would not be difficult to accept it considering that it is consistent with the idiosyncrasies of the Shīʿah and their ominous Taqiyyah would actually obligate them to go to these lengths.

Lisān al-Mīzān exposes some of these fraudsters

It appears from the declaration of *Lisān al-Mīzān* that many Shīʿī scholars were guilty of this. One of them is Ḥārith ibn Ghasīn, who actually transmits from Aʿmash رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّٰهُ. Ḥārith ibn Muḥammad Maʿkūf is another such narrator, as well as Ḥasan ibn ʿAlī ibn Zakariyyā ibn Ṣāliḥ Abū Saʿīd ʿAdawī al-Miṣrī. The latter would transmit fictitious reports by ascribing it to credible chains of transmission.

Nevertheless, how long are we going to keep our tongues moist with the praises of the great Shīʿī scholars, even one such example is excessive.

In case some simple-minded Muslim finds this exposition appalling, we would like to refer to the following verse of the Qur'ān, which highlights this mischief of the Shīʿah, and it almost seems as if its contents apply to them more than anyone else:

وَمَنْ أَظْلَمُ مِمَّنِ افْتَرَىٰ عَلَى اللّٰهِ الْكَذِبَ

And who is more unjust than one who invents about Allah untruths.[1]

---

1 Sūrah al-Ṣaff: 7.

It is evident from this verse that there are those who conspire and scheme in order to create turmoil and strife, and to deceive and mislead simple-minded people. None have excelled the Shīʿah at this and why should this be surprising when deceit is the most fundamental tenet of their religion. Who else would speak lies if they do not? Actually, they have surpassed all limits in this aspect.

Therefore, if their dubious narration of Fadak has found its way in some Sunnī books, it is purely due to the deceit which the Ahl al-Sunnah were victims of on account of having good thoughts about those who hid behind the garb of Taqiyyah. Whilst the Muḥaqqiqīn unveiled this evil and publicised it, there efforts were not completely successful because it is impossible to recall a word once it has left the lips, just as the arrow that leaves the bow cannot return.

Inevitably the false narrations gained publicity and spread with rapid momentum, stirring confusion in the minds of the unwary and leading those who had inclinations to Shīʿī beliefs and the *Tafḍīli's*[1] to misguidance and deviation. These distortions led to misguidance just as the distortions of the Torah and Injīl led people astray.

However, with the revelation of the Qur'ān these distortions were rectified and the light of guidance shown once again for those who were groping in darkness. Similarly, authentic narrations and the research of the Muḥaqqiqīn scholars rectified these distortions. Whoever had the capacity to embrace guidance embraced it, whilst those whose potential was inherently evil, remained astray.

So it is not far-fetched if ʿAmmār ʿAlī and the likes of him fail to accept reform and prefer to stubbornly conform to the misguidances of their deviant predecessors. They are like those whose hearts were sealed so that the truth of the Qur'ān failed to penetrate it. So ʿAmmār ʿAlī is just like them as birds of a feather flock together. How true is the statement:

Whoever Allah sends astray, there is no guide for him.[2]

1 Those who were of the opinion that Sayyidunā ʿAlī رضي الله عنه was the most superior of all the Ṣaḥābah, while still maintaining respect and admiration for all the other Ṣaḥābah.

2 Sūrah al-Aʿrāf: 186.

One step lower

For arguments sake, let us accept that the Shīʿī report regarding the gifting of Fadak is correct, then too it does not achieve the aims of the Shīʿah.

This is because if their narration is *ṣaḥīḥ* (authentic), our narration which appears in *Mishkāt* is *aṣaḥ* (most authentic). If their narration is strong, ours is stronger. Therefore, their narration cannot have preference over ours.

In case this logic of the stronger being preferred to the strong and the more authentic dominating authentic does not appeal to you, then this is the standard which all human beings apply equally all the time. But logic does not appeal to the Shīʿah, because if logic appealed to them, they would have to forsake their faith and they are in bliss upon their devious path. They are bent on differing and the differences found within them are unlike any other. Those who have seen the *Tuḥfah*, *Muntahā al-Kalām*, and other compilations of Ḥaydar ʿAlī would attest to this. Our treatise has also exposed some of these differences in a small way.

In fact, we do not have to go too far away. Have we not read that ʿAmmār ʿAlī maintains that the Prophet ﷺ had one daughter only, whereas al-Kulaynī and *Nahj al-Balāghah* clearly confirm otherwise, let alone the plural of daughters appearing in the Qur'ān regarding the daughters of the Prophet ﷺ.

We would now like to ask ʿAmmār ʿAlī (to resolve this issue)—although he is lying, but asserts to be truthful and his followers have no alternative but to follow him in this matter—why he considers his narration to be authentic whereas *al-Kāfī* of al-Kulaynī is the most authentic Shīʿī reference and *Nahj al-Balāghah* is almost like divine revelation, and the Qur'ān is nothing but divine revelation (and all these contradict his report)? So probably he would say that the Qur'ān is incorrect as Allah is a victim of Badā', whilst *al-Kāfī* and *Nahj al-Balāghah* record the statements of the Imāms, whose knowledge comes from Allah and His Rasūl ﷺ and since Allah is prone to Badā', the same possibility arises once again. So, you—who has now broken all links between yourself and Allah and His Rasūl (due to Badā'), on what basis have you given preference to your narration about the daughters of the Prophet ﷺ over the testimony of Allah and the statements of *al-Kāfī* and *Nahj*? Do you consider yourself right in giving preference in this manner or not? If you consider yourself right, then that is exactly what we are saying that all human

beings give preference to more authentic facts over authentic facts, to stronger reports over strong ones. Otherwise you have to admit that your report is incorrect.

For those who believe that the less-authentic gains preference over the more-authentic, we will falsify this logic with the following words of Sayyidunā ʿAlī رضي الله عنه from *Nahj al-Balāghah*:

> الزموا السواد الاعظم فان يد الله على الجماعة و اياكم و الفرقة فان الشاذ من الناس للشيطان كما ان الشاذ من الغنم للذئب
>
> Follow the greater majority because the hand of Allah is with the group and avoid differing because the one who splits and is all by himself is vulnerable to Shayṭān just as the lone sheep is more vulnerable to the wolf.

Based on the above, if we accept that ʿAmmār ʿAlī's narration about one daughter only is correct and authentic at most, then in giving preference to this authentic narration we would be differing with the whole world on this issue and it would result in us being the victims of Shayṭān. So, all the best to ʿAmmār ʿAlī if that is what he wishes for himself.

It seems as if Allah has created the Shīʿah for being examples of steadfastness upon misguidance, since they do not desist despite such overwhelming evidence. Just like how the sunlight is of no benefit to the blind, these blind-hearted one's cannot benefit from the light of guidance.

Therefore, only that person can doubt the preference of the narration of *Mishkāt* who doubts whether it is day when the sun is shining brightly.

The gifting of Fadak is not established even if their narration is considered authentic

Even if they do not wish to accept, we must proceed, as we need to establish the truth. So, let us assume that their invalid report is authentic and let us then assume that despite being less-authentic, it has to be given preference over the more authentic narration of *Mishkāt*, then too lies will ultimately fail and the Shīʿah objective cannot be accomplished. This is because this devious narration which found its way in some unknown and unheard of Sunnī references does not contain any such word whereby gifting Fadak to Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها can be established. Instead,

the word "*aʿṭā*" appears which equally denotes borrowing and gifting. To convince the reader, I will record the narration as it is.

Al-Ṣawāʿiq al-Muḥriqah—which has been written by Ibn Ḥajar al-Haythamī in refutation of Shīʿī beliefs—contains the following concocted report of the Shīʿah, whereby they actually intended to criticise Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه but actually praised him on account of his good-fortune. And even though it praises him, it will still appear as condemnation only for ʿAmmār ʿAlī and his likes. The narration is as follows:

> وأخرج الحافظ عمر بن شبة أن زيدا هذا الإمام الجليل قيل له إن أبا بكر انتزع من فاطمة فدك فقال إنه كان رحيما وكان يكره أن يغير شيئا تركه رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم فأتته فاطمة رضي الله عنها فقالت له إن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم أعطاني فدك فقال هل لك بينة فشهد لها علي وأم أيمن فقال لها فبرجل وامرأة تستحقيها ثم قال زيد والله لو رجع الأمر فيها إلي لقضيت بقضاء أبي بكر رضي الله عنه
>
> Ḥāfiẓ ʿUmar ibn Shabbah transmits from Zayd—the illustrious Imām (the son of Imām Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn)—that someone said to him that Abū Bakr had snatched Fadak from Fāṭimah, whereupon he said, "Abū Bakr was extremely compassionate (so how would he do something like that). (Actually) He disliked changing something that the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم had done. So, Fāṭimah came to him and said that the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم had given her Fadak. He asked: "Do you have any witness?" So ʿAlī and Umm Ayman testified. He said, "A decision cannot be made with the testimony of one male and one female." Zayd then said, "By the oath of Allah, if this matter was brought to me, I would pass judgement according to the judgement of Abū Bakr."

Now examine this report closely, despite it being a fabrication of outwardly righteous and inwardly impure people hiding in the garb of Taqiyyah, it has no mention of the Hibah of Fadak to Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها. It miraculously contains certain truths too, but the actual term that was vital to establish her ownership eluded them. Consider also the glowing tribute paid to Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه by this illustrious Imām, who is after all the son of the 'infallible' Imām.

Nevertheless, we were saying that even if this narration is free from every other defect and we equate it to the narration of *Mishkāt*, then too the ownership of

Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها cannot be determined. If this narration is legitimate then we would say that Sayyidunā Zayd's response to them is classified as *Mumashāt ma ʿal-Khaṣm*[1], that if we were to accept that it was taken then it was because of such and such reason. Nevertheless, it is obvious that it does not prove Hibah in any way.

The fact that ʿAṭā' denotes gifting and borrowing as established from a popular Ḥadīth

The word ʿAṭā' or Aʿṭā translates as giving in English. It refers equally to Hibah—which is giving permanent ownership—as well as borrowing or allowing temporary benefit. The justification for this is found in an authentic ḥadīth unanimously agreed upon by both sides, which is as follows:

أن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم قال يوم خيبر لأعطين هذه الراية غدا رجلا يفتح الله على يديه ، يحب الله ورسوله ، ويحبه الله ورسوله

> A day prior to handing over the flag to Sayyidunā ʿAlī for the battle of Khaybar, the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم said, "I will give the banner tomorrow to a person who loves Allah and His Rasūl and he is also beloved to Allah and His Rasūl."

Now consider the word *aʿṭā* which appears here; no one claims that it suggests giving permanent ownership—i.e. Hibah—to Sayyidunā ʿAlī رضي الله عنه. Instead, it denotes a temporary appointment and an *amānah* (trust) which has time constraints and it can be revoked or discontinued at any time. If a King appoints someone as the minister, or if he keeps someone in charge of his treasury and hands the keys over to them, it signifies that they have a temporary appointment, which can be discontinued at any time and they have been placed in a position of amānah.

The Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم was in the position of a general in all the battles he fought and handing over any assignment or task to any soldier by giving the banner to him was also a position of trust no different from any of the above instances.

Since it is evident from the above that ʿaṭā' and aʿṭā' could also denote giving as an amānah, it could also imply that when Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها said that Fadak had been given to her in the lifetime of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم, she actually meant that she was allowed to benefit from its profits only as an amānah, and whilst she does not consider it to be her sole property, she merely requested that she be allowed

1 Hypothetically agreeing with the plaintiff.

to continue benefiting from its revenue after his demise and that it should not be disposed off to the poor, destitute, and wayfarer like the rest of the Prophet's ﷺ material possessions.

As for Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه requesting evidence and testimony from Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها (despite him being extremely merciful according to the declaration of Sayyidunā Zayd رحمه الله and extremely merciful people cannot be so hard-hearted, especially towards Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها as mercy to her is incumbent more than ever on account of the mercy her father showed humanity) it should be put into its proper context. Therefore, it is probable that the Prophet ﷺ did allow Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها to benefit from the revenue of Fadak just before his demise and that this may have occurred without Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه having any knowledge of it as he had always known the Prophet ﷺ to have sole authoritative rights over it. As a result of this, Fadak ought to be disposed as the remaining possessions of the Prophet ﷺ. Therefore, when Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها laid claim to its revenue all of a sudden, he found himself in a predicament. Pleasing Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها was a crucial matter, but more so was following the Sunnah of the Prophet ﷺ regarding which Sayyidunā Zayd رحمه الله said, "That he disliked doing anything contrary to the manner in which the Prophet ﷺ did."

He was thus obligated to consider both dimensions. As for consideration for Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها, this obligation also stems from the compulsion to follow and obey the Prophet ﷺ. Therefore, whilst there is great emphasis on fulfilling the rights of the Ahl al-Bayt, it ultimately cannot surpass the obligation of complying with the ways and manner of the Prophet ﷺ. Consequently, the verse which prohibits saying "'uff" or its kind to one's parents is not restricted to this utterance and it implies that the utterance of that which is worse than this is far more heinous.

Therefore, just as we would not displease the Prophet ﷺ in religious matters, we would consider it equally necessary to follow his directives in matters relating to the hereafter. This is because the actual purpose of sending the Messenger ﷺ is to rectify our religious affairs and our matters of the life of the hereafter. In the case of Fadak, which was a monetary obligation—in (handing over Fadak to Sayyidah Fāṭimah) there was a possibility of violating the practice of the Prophet ﷺ as he distributed its revenue to the poor, the destitute, and the wayfarer.

But since Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ—in this delicate situation—could not fully accede nor could he openly reject her claim, he sincerely opted for a route whereby he could pacify her feelings too without compromising the truth at the same time. He, thus, asked her for witnesses so that perhaps her claim could be established that the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ had given special concession to her to benefit from its revenue whilst it retained its actual status of being a general Waqf. Therefore, Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ was reluctant to refuse blatantly on account of the relationship to the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and at the same time he did openly express that he would continue to execute its affairs as the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ (which is what he was bound to do).

Therefore, Allah provided a solution whereby Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا would also not harbour bitter feelings. Consequently, she was unable to satisfy the legal requirement of witnesses, which absolves Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ of satisfying her wishes without implicating him in any way. Therefore, he had a legitimate excuse and noble people—among whom Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا is the noblest—wholeheartedly accept the excuse of one who is not guilty of shortcoming. Even if his noble action—of requesting witnesses—does not extol his greatness, it certainly removes any ill-feeling from the heart of Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا towards him (as he was just doing what he was obligated to).

Therefore, Sayyidah Fāṭimah was ultimately pleased with Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ, which will soon be recorded from Shīʿī references. Similarly, the declaration by Sayyidunā Zayd رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ that he would pass the same verdict of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ also proves that Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا was not grieved by Sayyidunā Abū Bakr's رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ decision. If she was grieved initially, this was ultimately resolved and the matter was settled harmoniously. Had she left this world displeased with Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ, not one of the Ahl al-Bayt would have paid glowing tribute to him as is the case with this narration of Sayyidunā Zayd رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ.

Therefore, if the Shīʿī scholars accept that this report is a fabrication then that would be good. But if they consider it a legitimate report then too, it does not record anything contentious or incorrect, which should give them any reason to argue with the Ahl al-Sunnah. But if they cannot understand the above explanation then what can they understand after all?

A failed attempt to establish that Aʿṭā’ denotes Hibah

It is possible that they endeavour to twist the matter once again by saying that aʿṭā’ does denote temporary use or borrowing, but its actual (and true) meaning is not that and there must be some factor which necessitates this particular connotation. In the absence of such a factor, temporary usage cannot be determined as the implication of aʿṭā’.

We reject this altogether and condemn them for making claims without providing substantiation. Therefore, this claim is discarded.

If they are not pleased with this retort then just as they present an unjustified report and quarrel with the Ahl al-Sunnah because of that, we would also respond by presenting a completely unsubstantiated claim by saying that aʿṭā’ equally denotes both meanings and both meanings can be expressed by the word aʿṭā’.

Actually, what they are saying is not completely incorrect. A word must imply what it has been coined for unless there are circumstances which warrant otherwise. Consequently, there must be additional factors preferring one meaning over the other. However, it is not necessary for such a motivating factor to be a verbal statement. Similarly, the need for a motivating factor is evident since it would prevent the person from misunderstandings and errors. Therefore, it is probable that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه assessed the material possessions of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم upon assuming the khilāfah. He then assessed the situation of Fadak and concluded that the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم enjoyed sole authority over it till the end, which has also been confirmed by the admission of Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها and other members of the Ahl al-Bayt, and they knew better as they are the immediate family of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم.

Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه subsequently decided to handle its affairs personally, but Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها intervened and informed him that (the benefits of) Fadak were given to her by the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم. Therefore, though they do not have ownership, they should be entitled to retain its revenue.

Based on what he knew about Fadak, Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه thus understood that aʿṭā’ denotes temporary benefit and use, not permanent ownership. Similarly, the manner in which she asked for Fadak also establishes that aʿṭā’ denotes temporary utilisation. Similarly, her request to continue benefitting from it was on the basis

of the distinctively unique position of the Ahl al-Bayt and the extra special loyalty of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهُ to this illustrious household.

Had Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهُ not adopted this course of action, it would have been easy for any Ṣaḥābī to make claims upon the Khulafā' in the name of the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. What can then be said about the glorious members of the household and Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهَا in particular, when her claim is directed to none other than Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهُ, the most devoted servant of the household.

Sayyidunā ʿUmar broke the conduit of Sayyidunā ʿAbbās رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهُ as it was in too close proximity to al-Masjid al-Nabawī. However, when Sayyidunā ʿAbbās رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهُ confronted him and asked him how he had the authority to break something that was installed by the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, then history records how Sayyidunā ʿUmar رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهُ mended it with his own hands and reinstated it.

Therefore, whilst Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهَا is perfectly entitled to make such a demand considering her unique position, Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهُ had to contend with the following words of the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ which we will discuss shortly:

ما تركنا صدقة

What we leave behind is charity

Similarly, the testimonies also fell short of the requirement and it did not bear favourably for her. Added to this was the Prophet's صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ continuous practice of allotting the shares of the needy, the destitute, and the wayfarer.

Therefore, even if we accept the fabricated Shīʿī report in its entirety it does not bear negatively on the ḥadīth of *Mishkāt* nor does it establish any criticism against the Ahl al-Sunnah. Conversely, it establishes the merit of Ṣiddīq al-Akbar. Now if they (cry foul and they) wish to consider this narration a fabrication, then by all means. But if they accept it as a valid narration, then they must accept it as explained in its proper context.

Criticism against Sayyidunā Zayd

If they offer the unacceptable excuse that even though the narration is correct, Sayyidunā Zayd رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّٰهُ passed away, Allah forbid, as a disbeliever according to their view because the Imām at that time was Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq and he had no business

waging jihad and usurping the rights of the Imām. Since he did wage Jihad, it seems as if he considered himself the Imām and since it is only possible to have one Imām at one time, the other is an imposter and he is just like the person who makes a false claim of Nubuwwah. Since such a person is a kāfir, or the worst type of kāfir, the same is applicable in this case. So, what weight would his words have and how would he be able to represent the Shīʿī creed adequately? However, had he stated that Fadak was gifted to Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها—which is against his view—it would have been accepted but the explanation of temporary usage does not permit this possibility too be entertained.

Nevertheless, listen to the defence of Sayyidunā Zayd رحمه الله presented by their own Qāḍī Nūr Allāh. Why should we bear the responsibility of establishing his merit? Nūr Allāh's words have higher status that divine revelation and this is what he records in Majālis al-Mu'minīn on the authority of Fuḍayl ibn Yasār, who transmits from the transcripts of Shaykh ibn Bābuwayh:

> Fuḍayl narrates that he participated in the battle which Zayd fought against the rebellious forces of Hishām. He narrates that when he returned to Madinah and met Imām Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq, who asked him: "Did you participate in the battle which my uncle fought against the people of Syria?"
>
> I replied: "Yes."
>
> He asked: "How many Syrians did you slay?"
>
> I said: "Six."
>
> He asked: "Do you have any reservations about it being lawful to take their lives?"
>
> I said: "If I had reservations, why would I take their lives."
>
> Thereupon Imām Jaʿfar said, "May Allah grant me a share of the reward of their jihad. By the oath of Allah, my uncle Zayd is a martyr along with his companions who have been killed and he has encountered a similar condition which ʿAlī and his companions encountered."[1]

Now consider the words of this Imām and his keen desire to be amongst those who fought this battle. Since Sayyidunā Zayd رحمه الله has been likened to Sayyidunā ʿAlī

1 *Al-Amālī al-Shaykh al-Ṣadūq*, p. 431.

رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, there can be no possibility of considering him a kāfir. Instead, he is among the cream of the Awliyā' and the esteemed martyrs. Otherwise there is no possibility of the Imām wishing to resemble him. This establishes that he was in conformity with the beliefs and principles of Imām Jaʿfar رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ in every way and that he bore resemblance to Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ in his own way like the rest of the Imāms, such as Imām al-Bāqir, Imām Jaʿfar, Sayyidunā Ḥasan, and Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ. However, none of them could be completely like Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.

Nevertheless, the words of Sayyidunā Zayd رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ would be considered final on this highly sensitive issue where both Sunni's and Shīʿah maintain that the group on the right path is entitled to Paradise and those who are wrong would be deserving of punishment.

Therefore, the contentious narration of gifting Fadak to Fāṭimah is a fabrication and despite this, it has made its way into some Sunnī resources for reasons already deliberated upon. Secondly, we have used the fabricated report about Sayyidunā Abū Bakr, from *al-Ṣawāʿiq al-Muḥriqah* against you, but will it ever be possible for those to understand who lack understanding so direly? How foolish of them to then rant and rave about something which actually is against them, and ʿAmmār ʿAlī then using it to deceive simple-minded Muslims is the height of shamelessness.

Taking the apparent literal meaning into consideration

If the Shīʿah refuse to bow down and shamelessly assert that whilst aʿṭā' does denote temporary usage, the instinctively apparent meaning that comes to mind when this word is used is Hibah, and it should be the preferred connotation especially in this narration.

However, before agreeing to this, we would request them to first apply this same principle to the statements of the Imāms, especially Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ in praise of the Ṣaḥābah and Abū Bakr and ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ—some of which has appeared in this treatise—and thereby release themselves from the clutches of Shīʿism. Similarly, they should take the immediate implication of the Qur'ānic words and verses in praise of the Ṣaḥābah and believe whole-heartedly in it. We have every right to make this request to them, and if they agree to it, then no matter what, we will also accommodate their request.

Secondly, we say to this that if every text must be considered by its superficial, cursory implications then what is the value of depth in understanding and wisdom. Is it not failure to understand matters in its proper context that gives rise to so many misconceptions?

The differences of the Imāms of the Ahl al-Sunnah and likewise the differences of the Shīʿī mujtahidīn also arise from this. The difference between the *Akhbāris* and the *Uṣūlīs* amongst Shīʿī scholars also stems from this particular aspect. The Akhbārī takes what appears to be the cursory implication, whilst the Uṣūlī seeks to penetrate the depths and understand the objective of the sharīʿah and he is not content with remaining on the surface.

So if ʿAmmār ʿAlī wishes to take Hibah as the apparent and immediate implication of the word aʿṭā' and he wishes to remain embroiled in debate with us, then let him first disassociate himself from the Uṣūlī position and embrace the Akhbārī stance fully, so that we could really make him understand the baselessness of his beliefs.

Debating from an Akhbārī stance

Therefore, we say that we would accept that aʿṭā' denotes Hibah in this contentious narration, but only what will ʿAmmār ʿAlī and all Shīʿī scholars say about the fact that this narration is classified as Munqaṭiʿ? There was no existence of Sayyidunā Zayd رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّٰهُ at the time when Fāṭimah requested Fadak, which must have been shortly after the departure of the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.

Therefore, the narration of Sayyidunā Zayd رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّٰهُ is an unsubstantiated statement which deserves rejection. Yes, had Sayyidunā Zayd رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّٰهُ been a legitimate Imām of the Shīʿah then his word could have been conclusive evidence for the Shīʿah only, who maintain that the Imām has unseen knowledge. However, Sayyidunā Zayd رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّٰهُ does not enjoy this privilege. Let alone being an Imām, he is not classified as a believer according to them.

The Ahl al-Sunnah are better off. Whilst they consider him to be among the high-ranking Awliyā', they would have to discard his statement because the principles of the Akhbārī's demands just that.

The possibility that he met a Ṣaḥābī and transmitted from him does exist, but if he transmits from a Tābiʿī, then this is also questionable as the liars made their appearance already and who did he receive this from? If Sayyidunā Zayd رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّٰهُ met

some very senior Ṣaḥābī then too we would need to verify if this Ṣaḥābī was narrating a first-hand account or he too relates it from someone. Who is this someone? Or did he just narrate something from someone who transmitted something which was commonly publicised as such. The possibilities are endless. How would we then determine that Fadak was gifted to her?

The condition of the narration of Mishkāt

As for the narration of *Mishkāt*, it is *marfūʿ* and *muttaṣil*. As for the Qur'ānic verse, it is mutawātir. However, it is possible for some ignorant person to claim that this narration is also baseless and disconnected since ʿUmar ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz was not alive when this episode occurred.

Since we have established that their report is baseless, it makes no difference if we consider our narration baseless too, but for the benefit of the Shīʿah, we would not leave any matter unresolved. Therefore, though this appears as the statement of ʿUmar Ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, it is actually transmitted from Mughīrah ibn Shuʿbah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. When a Ṣaḥābī relates some action or utterance of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, it is classified as a marfūʿ transmission for those who are unaware of the principles of ḥadīth.

In addition to this, there is another logical reason why ʿUmar ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz statement is correct. ʿUmar ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz is explaining the reason for not taking control of Fadak, and he presents the fact that the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ did not give it to Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا as his reason for not taking control of it. He has no personal motive in this at all. Thus, if his intention was not to take it then just as the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ not giving it to Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا was a sufficient enough reason for him not to take, the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ gifting it to her would have also been a reason for him not to take it—if it were true that it happened—and in fact a greater reason.

So, if according to the Shīʿah this verdict is incorrect, and instead the opposite of it being Hibah is correct, then we ask what need was there for him to cause such harm to himself, in this world—by depriving himself of Fadak and giving it away—and in the hereafter, by speaking such a lie. And that too against whom? Against the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ! Why would he attribute a lie to the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, the punishment for which is hell as recorded in perhaps the only ḥadīth which is considered mutawātir in word and meaning:

من كذب على متعمدا فليتبوأ مقعده من النار

Whoever intentionally ascribes a lie to me, should take his seat in the Fire.

Nevertheless, the ḥadīth of Zayd رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّٰهُ, even if we overlook the fact that it is fabricated, it still does not have an unbroken link to the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.

Fadak was overseen by the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ till the end of his life

In addition to being a marfūʿ transmission, the signs of authenticity are visibly clear in the narration of *Mishkāt*. As for the other, in addition to being disconnected, the signs of fabrication and falsehood trickle from it. This is because historians are unanimous that Fadak remained under the administration of the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ till the end of his life and a gift for which one has not assumed possession of is not considered finalised and complete. In fact, it would be considered as the possession of the actual owner. Since it was the possession of the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهُ knew that it must be regarded as Waqf after the demise of the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. Why would he then even bother to seek witnesses when there was no question of giving it. This is because if the witnesses fulfilled the requirements then it would not have been possible for him to claim that the gift was not complete since the beneficiary did not assume control and possession, and it would then be obvious that he was just looking for a way to avoid handing over Fadak. If this statement had any validity, why did he not express it at the outset?

If the Shīʿah wish to consider his request for evidence a procedure for ascertaining the truth then what transpired thereafter should be justice and fairness as he merely did what he was compelled to, without establishing a new law on his own. If they accept what I have stated earlier on about the request for evidences and testimony then it surely would delight me, but can such a thought be entertained about those who are bereft of intelligence.

If Fadak was inheritance, then one person's possession of it should be regarded as oppression to the remaining heirs

It has been established that Fadak remained under the administration of the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ till the end of his life and it is unanimous between the Shīʿah and Ahl al-Sunnah that the gifting of Fadak was incomplete, even if the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ did give it to her. So why would Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهَا—whom we consider protected,

and they infallible—go on to make such a claim which results in taking what is due to others? If the Prophet's ﷺ material possessions are inherited then—in making such a claim—it deprives the remaining heirs. If not, then her claim would deprive the needy, the destitute, and the wayfarer. And if not them, then the estate would be considered Waqf, where the khalīfah has the right to dispense its revenue or the actual item according to his qualified discretion. Assuming he decided to hand it over to Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها, how good would that have been? But surely Sayyidah Fāṭimah's رضي الله عنها claim to it in this manner is not becoming of her.

Nevertheless, the signs of truthfulness are evident in the narration of *Mishkāt* whilst the signs of falsehood are glaring from the contentious report. Those who have understanding can see the truth clearly like the brightness of the sun, but ʿAmmār ʿAlī and his associates should be excused. What fault is there of the sun if such blind one's fail to see its brilliance?

Therefore, the narration in conflict with the one in *Mishkāt* is not of that calibre which demands that it be preferred over that which is in *Mishkāt*. Rather, according to the principles of ḥadīth the conflict between a strong and weak report demands that the weak report be rejected especially when—in a case like this—the stronger one is ascribed to Abū Dāwūd, which enjoys a distinct position as one of the six canonical collections of ḥadīth. Therefore, the narration ascribed to Sayyidunā Zayd رحمه الله must be discarded.

Evidence about the beneficiary assuming control being a prerequisite from Shīʿī references

If we assume that the narration is valid and that Sayyidah Fāṭimah's رضي الله عنها claim that it was gifted to her is in place, then too both sides maintain that the beneficiary must assume control in order for the gift to be complete. Therefore, as long as the owner does not cease control over the item, it remains his sole property. Consequently, ʿAllāmah al-Ḥillī states the following in *Maṭlab al-Awwal*, under the discussion on claims:

فلا تسمع دعوى الهبة مجردة عن دعوى القبض

The claim of Hibah will not be heard without the claim of possession.[1]

1 *Al-Yanābīʿ al-Fiqhiyyah*, vol. 33 p. 39-29.

And Fadak remained in the possession of the Prophet ﷺ until his demise—according to the consensus of both groups—and throughout his life he maintained sole control over it, and Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها never once interfered with this. The historians of both parties—Ahl al-Sunnah and Shīʿah—are in agreement upon this, in fact so are the Muḥaddithīn of both parties.

Whilst it is not necessary to document the record of historians on account of easy access to historical journals, it is somewhat important to record the relevant ḥadīth reports; because they may be inaccessible to most people and because ḥadīth reports are weightier than historical reports.

The Ḥadīth reports of both sides

The ḥadīth of the Ahl al-Sunnah is the very ḥadīth of *Mishkāt* which bears ample testimony to this. Secondly, *Mishkāt* also records the ḥadīth of Sayyidunā ʿUmar رضي الله عنه, transmitted by Malik ibn Aws ibn al-Hadathān, regarding the wealth of Fay', which comprised of Banū Nadhīr, Khaybar and Fadak. It states that the Prophet ﷺ allocated its revenue to three specific recipients. As for Fadak, the Prophet reserved its revenue for the wayfarer.

Now according to the laws of debate, our reference to our authentic resources suffices us because an objection can only be considered detrimental if it has substance. Since the administration of Fadak was the prerogative of the Prophet ﷺ till the end, the claim of Hibah is baseless as there was no handing over of control. So why should we take the responsibility of establishing from their resources, when the objection is baseless—since they agree that Hibah requires ownership.

However, silencing the opponent is one matter and giving them a satisfying response is another. Therefore, whilst this much silences the Shīʿah, he has no confidence in the authentic narrations of the Ahl al-Sunnah and thus still remains uneasy. Therefore, I quote an extract from *Misbāḥ al-Sālikīn*, which is a reliable reference of the Imāmiyyah. This narration appears in other references as well and I will record the complete narration later on. Consider the following:

> When Abū Bakr realised that Fāṭimah was keeping a distance from him and avoiding meeting him or mentioning anything about Fadak, then he became somewhat perturbed. He thus decided to please her. So, he went to her and said, "O daughter of the Prophet ﷺ, your claim is true but what am I to

> do because I saw the Prophet ﷺ giving you what sufficed for you from it, and giving the labourers their share. As for the rest of it, he distributed it to the needy, the destitute and the wayfarer."
>
> Fāṭimah replied, "Continue to do the same, just as my father, the Prophet ﷺ, did."
>
> Abū Bakr said, "I promise to do exactly as the Prophet ﷺ did."
>
> Fāṭimah asked, "Are you making a promise to do the same?"
>
> Abū Bakr promised once again.
>
> Fāṭimah said, "O Allah, bear witness to this."
>
> Fāṭimah, thus, became pleased. Abū Bakr then gave her expenses and distributed the rest among the needy, the destitute, and the wayfarer.

Consider the excuse given by Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه, that he witnessed the Prophet ﷺ dealing with a Fadak in a specific way, which excused him from handing it entirely over to Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها, and her agreeing to it and instructing him to continue executing its affairs in the same way. This as well as her pleasure at the end proves that Fadak remained in the custody of the Prophet ﷺ till the end and she had no authority over its affairs.

Similarly, he did not reject her claim that it was gifted to her. He entertained it but then carried out his obligation of asking for witnesses so that he would not be giving it away unlawfully, nor would she be receiving it unlawfully. He also asked for witnesses so that if they could establish the claim, then although the possession had not occurred—which was a prerequisite—he could give her preference to Fadak, but what could he do if the required testimony fell short. As for not giving it to her solely because of her claim to it, the response to this will appear later.

Still, if some deviant Shīʿī still has reservations and questions as to why Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه was so intent on maintaining the rule of possession in gifts in relation to a gift given by the Prophet ﷺ. Is not an indication of the Prophet ﷺ sufficient? Therefore, it seems as if he had devious motives.

The response is that only Allah can spare one from such thoughts. This is the type of thoughts which troubled the Jews, Christians, Hindus and fire-worshippers regarding the Prophet ﷺ and it bothered the Khawārij regarding Sayyidunā

ʿAlī رضي الله عنه. Both these groups feel that the respective claims to Nubuwwah and to being the rightful khalīfah was nothing more than a plan to gain worldly power and status. It was deviously hatched.

Friends! It gives one joy to reason with those who are balanced and fair, but debating with an ignoramus, biased, foul mouthed opponent is nothing more than mental exertion and exhaustion. The remedy for them is the whip or the baton, since the evidence of the Qur'ān and logical arguments are futile. Never mind, if there are four fools gathered at one place then perhaps the fifth one with them has some sense. If we have lost hope in ʿAmmār ʿAlī then it would not be correct to say that all the Shīʿah are like him? Who knows?

Witnesses and Testimony — a Response

If the Shīʿī report is correct and Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه did seek witnesses, then we have explained a possible reason for seeking witnesses. However, seeking witnesses could be for one of two reasons; firstly, the nature of the case was such that it demanded witnesses. If so, then the witnesses must meet all the requirements stipulated for the case to be effectively settled. So, let the Shīʿī scholars notify us of the requirements for testimony as recorded in the Book of Allah. Similarly, does the Qur'ān give any concessions or privileges in this regard? Similarly, the integrity of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه is also established from the fact that when Sayyidunā ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه informed him that he had taken permission from the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم to recall Ḥakam back to Madinah and the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم had agreed, then Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه asked if he had witnesses. If according to the Shīʿah—Allah forbid—there was a hidden agenda against Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها on account of which he asked her to substantiate her claim with witnesses then why did he not forego this requirement for ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه, whom Sunnī and Shīʿah maintain he had an alliance and friendship with? This incident only serves to establish his steadfastness upon the truth and his integrity in his affairs.

Yet the Shīʿah are victims of animosity and hatred. It has wreaked such havoc in their hearts and minds that right seems wrong and wrong seems right and the capacity to distinguish has been compromised irretrievably.

Secondly, witnesses could be required to establish the integrity of the claimant. So, if the claimant is innocent and not susceptible to falsehood then why should

witnesses be required to verify his or her integrity. They should seek this answer from Allah because Allah has ordained a minimum of two witnesses in every case, irrespective of the integrity of the claimant or the nature of the claim. This law has not been formulated by the Ahl al-Sunnah. The Ahl al-Sunnah are only interested in carrying out the commands of Allah. If the Shīʿah are disinterested, it is their discretion.

Had this not been the case then why would the Ahl al-Sunnah maintain that if one person witnesses the crescent of ʿĪd all alone, and his testimony is either rejected because of being one person only or because of his immorality and unscrupulousness, then he should observe fasting with the rest of the people. Similarly, what prevents them from accepting the testimony of a group of righteous women, when no male concurs with their testimony? For that matter there are many non-Muslims who are known to be far more truthful than many Muslims.

Therefore, the satisfaction of the individual is not the criterion, complying with the divine law is. It is an expression of servitude and submission to Allah.

The wisdom and purpose of this divine law is to ascertain and establish the truth. If this matter is left to the discretion of the ruler or khalīfah, then firstly there would be the fear of favouritism. Secondly, everybody would lay claims and consider themselves truthful. This would lead to the breakdown of peace and harmony which is the fundamental the purpose for having rulers. Therefore, the law has been stipulated to maintain peace and harmony as far as possible. Even if it is not favourable to some, the law must still be applied unequivocally in all situations.

Therefore, seeking testimony from Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا—whose integrity is unparalleled according to both groups—should not require added clarification. If anyone feels that such a request from her is akin to suspicion and mistrust that is the result of a flaw in their understanding. People of understanding are not intimidated by this.

Sayyidah Fāṭimah would comply more with the requirements

Since we cannot dispute that complying with the commands of Allah is the standard for determining piety and righteousness, as Allah says:

إِنَّ أَكْرَمَكُمْ عِنْدَ اللّٰهِ أَتْقَاكُمْ

Indeed, the most noble of you in the sight of Allah is the most righteous of you.[1]

It implies that Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها ought to have complied to the greatest degree. Similarly, she also ought to have the highest regard for others who complied with the divine command. Based on this, the request for proof must have brought immense pleasure to her and she must have been extremely delighted with the response of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه. One wonders then, why the Shīʿah are so up in arms about this issue. It is like the situation where the claimant and defendant have settled the matter, but the judge still seems grumpy over the matter.

It is evident from the above discussion that there is a difference between rejecting the testimony of the witnesses and not passing judgement according to their testimony. Rejecting their testimony means that they are not credible, whilst not passing judgement according to their testimony could be because of not meeting the requirement in respect of witnesses.

Therefore, in the absence of two credible male witnesses or one male and two female witnesses, it would be impermissible for the judge to pass judgement in favour of the claimant despite the claimant and inadequate witnesses being held in the highest repute and esteem. If some fool misinterprets this action of the judge to denote rejection of the witnesses, then it is up to him. However, if the required number of witnesses are available and then the judgement is not given in favour of the claimant then it could be because of the rejection of the witnesses and their being not credible.

If we look back at the Shīʿī report, and consider it authentic, then it is apparent that Sayyidunā ʿAlī and Umm Ayman رضي الله عنهما do not satisfy the requirements as far as numbers of witnesses are concerned. And if according to the lies of ʿAmmār ʿAlī, Sayyidunā Ḥasan and Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رضي الله عنهما also testified then they were also incapable of testifying as they were children who lacked physical maturity.

Therefore, not passing judgement in her favour does not imply that Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه rejected the testimony of Sayyidunā ʿAlī, Umm Ayman, and Sayyidunā Ḥasan and Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رضي الله عنهم. Instead, it expresses his steadfastness upon the sharīʿah

1 Sūrah al-Ḥujurāt: 13.

and the Sunnah. Fools consider this otherwise, but the coming of Ambiyā’ also failed to rectify some people, what then if we fail? It reminds me of an incident mentioned by Imām al-Ghazālī رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ in one of his books:

> One day Nabī Mūsa عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ was seen running towards the mountain in a haste. Someone asked him why he was rushing so anxiously and he replied, “There is a fool coming this way.”
>
> The person asked, “So how does that affect you?”
>
> He replied, “There is no cure for foolishness, and it will not be removed by sound advice or the blessed company of a person; in fact, it has an adverse effect and may affect the latter.”

Someone said it so aptly:

لكل داء و واء يستطب به الا الحماقة داء لا دواء لها

For every illness and condition there is a cure;

Foolishness though, is an illness with no remedy.

The Narration of Minhāj al-Kirāmah

If the Shīʿah still have a gripe about the issue and they still doubt the genuineness of Ṣiddīq al-Akbar, then let them be silenced for once and for all with the following narration from *Minhāj al-Kirāmah*, written by their ʿAllāmah Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī, who is well known for his extensive writings against the Ahl al-Sunnah.

> *Their own batons striking their own heads.*

The Ahl al-Sunnah are now absolved of responding since the Shīʿah have settled the issue for them:

وَكَفَى اللّٰهُ الْمُؤْمِنِيْنَ الْقِتَالَ وَكَانَ اللّٰهُ قَوِيًّا عَزِيْزًا

> *And sufficient was Allah for the believers in battle, and ever is Allah Powerful and Exalted in Might.*[1]

1 Sūrah al-Aḥzāb: 25.

The narration goes:

لما وعظت فاطمة ابا بكر في فدك كتب لها كتابا ورده عليها

> When Fāṭimah admonished Abū Bakr about Fadak, he wrote a document in her favour and restored it to her.

When this narration appears in such an authentic resource of the Shīʿah and its author is none author than ʿAllāmah Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī, then why argue with the Ahl al-Sunnah? This narration leaves them flabbergasted. They have been ranting and raving about the inheritance issue and that she received it as gift and they have made some claims but this narration, and from where it appears, leaves them speechless.

It is worth noting that let alone being defeated by what appears in our resources, ʿAmmār ʿAlī is always falsified by what appears in his books. A number of instances have already passed of this nature. In this instance consider how he has brewed the fiction of ʿAlī and Umm Ayman رضي الله عنهما testifying and dragging Sayyidunā Ḥasan and Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رضي الله عنهما into the issue. There is no mention of this fact in the entire library of Sunnī resources, even in the fabricated reports which the Shīʿah managed to get through. But if he alleges it does appear, then everybody can allege just about anything.

False allegation against Sayyidunā ʿUmar

ʿAmmār ʿAlī also says that when Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه wrote the document then Sayyidunā ʿUmar رضي الله عنه tore it up. Was he aware of the false allegation when he wrote it, because there is no reference to this in any of the references of the Ahl al-Sunnah? If this fact is being reported from their books then the first response to this is silence, as it is the best reply to a fool.

This is really a unique debate where the opponent is contesting what is a figment of his own imagination and it has no presence in any trusted resource. We need to ask him if *Minhāj al-Kirāmah* is a Sunnī book and if Shaykh Ibn Muṭahhar was a Sunnī? Or was he the son of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr or Sayyidunā ʿUmar's maternal aunt on account of whom he omitted the fact that ʿUmar رضي الله عنه tore up the document.

ʿAmmār ʿAlī is but a novice in the field of Shīʿī deception and forgery. Shaykh Ibn Muṭahhar is one of the experts and leaders in this field, whatever skill is to be found

in ʿAmmār ʿAlī is ten times more in him. However, it is true that some students excel their teachers. So, whilst Shaykh Ibn Muṭahhar had some sense, ʿAmmār ʿAlī is bereft of sense altogether.

Reasons why Sayyidunā Abū Bakr gave Sayyidunā Jābir wealth without testimony

ʿAmmār ʿAlī may have one more contention because Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه gave Sayyidunā Jābir رضي الله عنه wealth without requesting him to provide witnesses for his claim. Conversely, he dismissed Fāṭimah's رضي الله عنها claim despite credible witnesses.

Firstly, if this narration even appears as a valid narration in Sunnī resources, then it was possible for those who lack understanding and insight to find a reason for objection. It will be known shortly whether this narration even exists in Sunnī references and whether it is a concocted report or not. Assuming that it does not feature in Sunnī references, making an objection out of this only establishes their hindsight.

If this is the manner in which objections can be levelled against the Ahl al-Sunnah then tomorrow the distorted texts of the Old and New Testaments, or the Granth of the Sikhs could likewise establish great claims against the Ahl al-Sunnah. The Shīʿah would not have much of a problem with it because they have the ability to assimilate with each of these deviant groups. Had I not been apprehensive of prolonging this discussion, I would have clarified how the Shīʿah resemble a giraffe. This peculiar animal has an unusual resemblance to a camel, buffalo and a cheetah.

Nevertheless, assuming that this narration does appear in one or two odd resources from the lengthy list cited by ʿAmmār ʿAlī, it has no relevance since those are unknown resources anyway. Secondly, they may have found their way into those references after the Shīʿah tampered with it. The readers will realise this shortly.

We have clarified the reasons why witnesses were requested from Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها. Therefore, the incident of giving wealth to Jābir رضي الله عنه upon his oath—which was ultimately intended for him—without him satisfying the requirements of testimony cannot be likened to the incident of satisfying the claim of Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها without witnesses, as this could result in usurping the wealth of the needy, the destitute, and the wayfarer.

The fact that seeking witnesses from Sayyidah Fāṭimah can also be seen as an attempt to favour him

Although we have dealt with this elaborately, we are dealing with people who lack a sense of balance and fairness, so we are compelled to highlight the facts once again. Therefore, the Shīʿah and Ahl al-Sunnah are unanimous that Fadak remained under the sole administration of the Prophet ﷺ till the end of his life. When Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه knew that the material possessions of the Prophet ﷺ become Waqf after his demise and he also knew that a gift is incomplete without the beneficiary being given control over it, then his request for witnesses surely could not be for the sake of ascertaining if she had ownership of Fadak or not. Therefore, it is incorrect for any fool to claim that her claim was rejected despite credible witnesses whereas Sayyidunā Jābir's رضي الله عنه claim was satisfied without witnesses.

The only logical explanation for requesting her to provide witnesses would be to determine if there was any indication from the Prophet ﷺ on account of which Fadak could be given to her. Now is this gesture favouring Sayyidunā Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها or is it an insult to her and humiliation for her? The truth is evident for those who have understanding.

Failure to satisfy the claim of Sayyidunā Jābir could have been seen as a failure on the part of the Prophet ﷺ

ʿAmmār ʿAlī's thinking, however, is flawed. He views the action of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه regarding Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها negatively and implicates him for agreeing to the request of Sayyidunā Jābir رضي الله عنه.

Since there was a possibility that Sayyidunā Jābir's رضي الله عنه claim was correct because every claim cannot be false—and the Prophet ﷺ did make a commitment to him, Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه in his capacity as the deputy of the Prophet ﷺ was obliged to honour that commitment. If he did not oblige, it could have been seen as a failure to fulfil a commitment on the part of the Prophet ﷺ. To avert this, it was incumbent to oblige.

However, no blame could come directly upon the Prophet ﷺ since the wealth of Bahrain had not arrived. Since the position of the Prophet ﷺ is loftiest, it was unbecoming to allow this shortfall to remain. Therefore, when the wealth of

Bahrain arrived and Abū Bakr ﵁ was discharging any unsettled obligations of the Prophet ﷺ, he settled the matter of Jābir ﵁ because it is not necessary that such a commitment was made to him in the presence of others. Intelligent people understand that this was inevitable to avoid any tarnish being attributed to the Prophet ﷺ.

If the Prophet ﷺ did not commit to him and he made a false claim, then too it is inconsequential in the final equation since the wealth of Bahrain had to be distributed among the Ṣaḥābah anyway. The situation of Fadak was different; handing it over would constitute disobedience to the Prophet ﷺ as he retained control over it till the end of his life and it had to be dispensed as Ṣadaqah on the basis of his words, "whatever we leave behind is to be disposed off as charity." We have committed to shed light on this ḥadīth and the time is very near when we will deal with it, Allah willing.

Therefore, Fadak had become Waqf property and there was no possibility of anyone inheriting anything from it. If anyone inherited, it would be disregarding the above ḥadīth of the Prophet ﷺ. However, ʿAmmār ʿAlī and his cohorts consider honouring the commitment of the Prophet ﷺ and fulfilling his pledge something scornful and reprehensive.

When Abū Bakr ﵁ succeeded the Prophet ﷺ and the wealth of Bahrain arrived, he made announcements inviting those whom the Prophet ﷺ had unfulfilled commitments to, or those whom he had promised to receive their dues. This resulted in Sayyidunā Jābir ﵁ receiving 1500 coins. This gesture of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr ﵁ highlights his devotion to the Ahl al-Bayt and proves that he had no intentions of supressing anyone's dues. If he was so concerned about any possible commitments of the Prophet ﷺ that he liberally gave those who claimed, why would he then seek to withhold what was due to the soul who was dearest to the Prophet ﷺ.

Even if he withheld Fadak, then what did he gain from it. He neither used it for himself nor his family. Instead, he continued dispensing its revenue to the Ahl al-Bayt and to the recipients stipulated for it. It seems foolish then to withhold someone's dues without gaining anything from it other than perpetual criticism in this world and torment in the hereafter. Being so intelligent, did he not know how

to usurp something and make it worthwhile. After all, his intelligence cannot be disputed even by the Shīʿah.

Instead, the fact that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه understood the difference between the claim of Sayyidunā Jābir رضي الله عنه and the claim to Fadak proves what a genius he was. The claim of the Shīʿah of the gifting of Fadak is opposed by the ḥadīth, "what we leave behind is charity", whilst the claim of Sayyidunā Jābir رضي الله عنه cannot be countered by any ḥadīth. Similarly, there was no verse governing its revenue. Rather, it was either khums or ʿushr or some other tax, which Sayyidunā Jābir رضي الله عنه was fully entitled to.

It is also clear to those who have intelligence that witnesses are usually summoned when there is a need to settle a contention or when any matter requires justification. When two people are disputing a matter, witnesses are sought to dispel the contention. Therefore, if a claim is made and there are no legal or logical grounds for contesting it, and especially if it is made by a true Muslim, then does the ḥadīth not demand positive thoughts of every Muslim? If the Shīʿah do not have intellect, let them borrow some for a moment and reflect on this. It is for these enemies of intelligence that the Qur'ān proclaims:

Then will you not use reason?[1]

Therefore, if witnesses were not sought from Sayyidunā Jābir رضي الله عنه and witnesses were demanded from Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها, according to the Shīʿah allegation, then this establishes the great insight and wisdom of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه and his strict compliance to the teachings of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم. If these two matters, wisdom and following the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم are to be criticised, then ʿAmmār ʿAlī is correct in condemning him. If this is criticism, then we would praise him by saying that so and so is a donkey, a complete fool, steeped in immorality and vice, a liar and fraudster of a kind, etc.

If virtue is vice and vice is virtue, we would be compelled to sing the praises of ʿAmmār ʿAlī. But kindly do accept it from us in prose as we cannot render it in a poem.

1 Sūrah Ambiyā': 67.

Subḥān Allāh! The audacity to level criticisms against the most senior Ṣaḥābah and then deceive simple people by that. Consider the contents of his correspondence. He writes the following to Mīr Nādīr ʿAlī:

> **Now you decide whether this is injustice and oppression or not? If this is not usurpation, then what is? Similarly, is this classified as hatred for the Ahl al-Bayt or love? Is this what the rights of the Prophet ﷺ demand? The truth of the matter is that the Ahl al-Sunnah have such enmity for the Ahl al-Bayt that it makes them overlook the rights of the Prophet ﷺ.**
>
> **You have stated that you were not convinced about the Shīʿah stance of Fadak being oppressively withheld from Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها. Now, I ask you to record the response of the Ahl al-Sunnah in the light of what I have written. Ask them why Jābir was considered truthful and Sayyidah Fāṭimah al-Zahrā رضي الله عنها was not credible despite her presenting witnesses.**

So, I request them to present my response to ʿAmmār ʿAlī and let him know that unfortunately the Ahl al-Sunnah scholars could not verify what he has written since his claims are baseless. Ahl al-Sunnah scholars are not in the business of making wrong into right like their opponents do. Instead, they can rectify a wrong and make it known to the followers of ʿAmmār ʿAlī that his claims are wrong and that is why he has requested verification. The Ahl al-Sunnah are steadfast on the right path, so if guidance is your quest, grab the opportunity.

It is time to expose the reality of ʿAmmār ʿAlī, who utters nonsense and makes ignorant remarks. Despite such glaring evidence and testimony, he still maintains that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه usurped Fadak and that a devout soul like Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه was an oppressor. Even if he did not boast other merits, this single incident—as they claim—is sufficient to prove his merit. It proves his intelligence too and that despite knowing that he may be criticised for that, he remained steadfast on the command of Allah. When he did not profit from Fadak in any way, why would he be interested in usurping it?

Similarly, the fact that he may have sought witnesses from Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها and not from Sayyidunā Jābir رضي الله عنه makes another statement about justice and close ties. Consequently, those who have a very strong sense of justice are usually more stringent in applying the rules with their own, but they may be lenient to

others. Therefore, Sayyidunā Abū Bark's رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ not considering Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا establishes his genuine love for the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.

When avoiding favouritism to one's own and being lenient with others is a praiseworthy trait, then it was more incumbent upon him not to favour the family of the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, but apply the law correctly. So Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ remained steadfast and did not bother about criticism.

Dubious fanaticism

So, look at how they have twisted events. Despite being irreligious, they level claims of irreligiousness to those who are devout, and these followers of Ibn Saba' consider the devoted Ṣaḥābah to be enemies of the Ahl al-Bayt. If those who have trespassed the limits—in loving the Ahl al-Bayt—are considered greater than those who are devoted and loyal to them, and instead are actually considered their enemies, then this would be like saying that Christians love Nabī ʿĪsā عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ and that Nabī Muḥammad صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and his followers hate Nabī ʿĪsā عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ.

It is worth considering that one who is an extremist in his love is not necessarily in love with what he claims. Instead, he is love with his perceptions. Consequently, the Christians claim to love Nabī ʿĪsā عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ but they do not love him in reality, because what they are in love with is actually him being the son of God, which he is not.

Hence, the Shīʿah have this perception (and they are fanatical on this basis). In reality, they are bereft of love for the Imāms of the Ahl al-Bayt. If they consider the Ahl al-Sunnah to be the enemies of the Ahl al-Bayt, then this is just like the Christians considering the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and his Ummah enemies of Nabī ʿĪsā عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ.

The true enemies of the Ahl al-Bayt are those who do not regard Sayyidah Ruqayyah and Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا as the daughters of the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ despite the Book of Allah, the words of Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ, and the narrations of al-Kulaynī and others affirming this.

Similarly, they consider Sayyidah ʿĀ'ishah رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا—the beloved wife of the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and one who has been praised by Allah in Sūrah al-Nūr, and the other wives of the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ—regarding whom it is proclaimed:

وَأَزْوَاجُهُ أُمَّهَاتُهُمْ

and his wives are [in the position of] their mothers.[1]

as well as Sayyidunā ʿAbbās رَضِيَٱللَّهُعَنْهُ—the honourable uncle of the Prophet صَلَّىٱللَّهُعَلَيْهِوَسَلَّمَ, Sayyidunā Zubayr رَضِيَٱللَّهُعَنْهُ—who is the son of the Prophet's صَلَّىٱللَّهُعَلَيْهِوَسَلَّمَ paternal aunt (i.e. his cousin) and who enjoys other familial ties with him as well, Muṣʿab ibn Zubayr—the son-in-law of Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رَضِيَٱللَّهُعَنْهُ, Sayyidunā ʿUmar—who is the son-in-law of Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَٱللَّهُعَنْهَا, Sayyidunā Zayd—the son of Imām Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn, and many other close relatives of the Prophet صَلَّىٱللَّهُعَلَيْهِوَسَلَّمَ who all qualify to be part of his *ʿitrah* (family) and Ahl al-Bayt as non-believers, renegades and enemies of Islam.

The details pertaining to most of the above has passed in this book. Nevertheless, they shamelessly claim that the Ṣaḥābah were enemies of the Ahl al-Bayt. If Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَٱللَّهُعَنْهُ had enmity towards Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَٱللَّهُعَنْهَا then none among the Ahl al-Sunnah would have had anything to do with him. Or as is the case of the Khawārij—had the Ahl al-Sunnah been like them—they would have never revered Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَٱللَّهُعَنْهَا. Instead, they would have done as the Shīʿah do, Allah forbid, and adopted *Tabarrī* (disassociation) from the senior Ṣaḥābah.

Now consider, is it still correct for you to lament the religiousness of the Ahl al-Sunnah—in the light of your false claims—or is it the Shīʿah that are lamentable. More so ʿAmmār ʿAlī, whose hatred for the Ṣaḥābah leaves no consideration for the rights of the Prophet صَلَّىٱللَّهُعَلَيْهِوَسَلَّمَ. In fact, he has disregarded the testimony of Allah and the statements of the righteous Imāms. He brands whoever he sees among the Ahl al-Bayt as disbelievers and renegades on account of any inclination to the glorious Ṣaḥābah.

Luckily for the insensible scapegoat of Taqiyyah, otherwise Sayyidunā ʿAlī, Ḥasan Ḥusayn, Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn, Imām Jaʿfar, and Imām al-Bāqir also would have not been spared from the title of kufr. Have these souls not praised the senior Ṣaḥābah lavishly? As for Sayyidunā ʿAlī, Ḥasan and Ḥusayn, they played a dominant role in supporting the Ṣaḥābah and the three Khulafāʾ. Then they wish to know from us the difference between seeking testimony from Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَٱللَّهُعَنْهَا and releasing Sayyidunā Jābir رَضِيَٱللَّهُعَنْهُ from this obligation.

---

1 Sūrah al-Aḥzāb: 6.

If they classify the support and praises of Sayyidunā ʿAlī, Ḥasan, and Ḥusayn رضي الله عنهم and the other Imāms as Taqiyyah, why not consider the support of Sayyidunā ʿUmar and Sayyidunā ʿAbbās رضي الله عنهما also as Taqiyyah. Or if the statements and actions of Sayyidunā ʿUmar, Sayyidunā ʿAbbās, and Sayyidunā Zayd al-Shahīd are free from hypocrisy and deceit—or Taqiyyah—then why not consider the statements of Sayyidunā ʿAlī, Ḥasan and Ḥusayn رضي الله عنهم, and the rest of the Imāms free from hypocrisy and double-standards?

ʿAlī and Umm Ayman versus Allah and ʿAlī

Similarly, they should be told that we can agree that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه did not accept the testimony of Sayyidunā ʿAlī and Sayyidah Umm Ayman رضي الله عنهما as he was compelled to follow the command of the Qur'ān stipulating two male witnesses or two females and one male. But why did they reject the testimony of Allah regarding multiple daughters of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم and the testimony of Sayyidunā ʿAlī رضي الله عنه too in this regard. They cannot even say that the testimony of Allah and ʿAlī رضي الله عنه falls short of the requirement for testimony as far as numbers is concerned because the testimony of Allah and ʿAlī رضي الله عنه surpasses the requirement of two males or two females and a male. So why should the testimony of ʿAlī and Umm Ayman be valid but the testimony of Allah and ʿAlī invalid?

Even if we accept—for the sake of ʿAmmār ʿAlī—that there were four testimonies along with that of Ḥasan and Ḥusayn رضي الله عنهما, then although this still does not fulfil the requirement, we would ask them that when the Book of Allah and the statements of the glorious Imāms are profuse in the praise of the Ṣaḥābah, then why do they reject this testimony? This treatise has recorded the praises of the Ṣaḥābah from at least four Imāms. So, besides the testimony of Allah, this is adequate testimony. Why has it been rejected? If this is not the worst scenario of rejecting credible testimony than what is?

How lamentable is the religiousness of the Shīʿah? In venting their hatred for the Ṣaḥābah, they have not considered Allah, his Messenger and the illustrious Imāms too. Above all, they taunt the Ahl al-Sunnah. What foolishness!

ʿAmmār ʿAlī and his followers criticise Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه, whose merit is expressed by Allah and the illustrious Imāms. If this is not Kufr, then what is kufr? If this is not enmity for the Ahl al-Bayt, then what is?

The details of the above statement occur in this book and there is no need to repeat it. The respected reader can review it at its relevant place in the book.

They have criticised and condemned Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه on the basis of a baseless and fabricated narration, which has no place in any authentic Sunnī reference as it states that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه did not accept her claim without witnesses and when she did furnish witnesses, he rejected it. However, this narration—considering it valid—does not indicate that he considered the testimony false or that he suspected them of lies. Instead, his decision was governed by the Qur'ānic law and he could not satisfy Sayyidah Fāṭimah's رضي الله عنها request.

They condemn him on this basis and ignore the verses of the Qur'ān in his favour as well as the testimony and praise of the illustrious Imāms, which has been transmitted by credible narrators to them. And in the case of narrations the narration of a sole credible female narrator is also acceptable; there is no need for the required amount for testimony or for the narration to meet the criteria of *Tawātur*[1].

Nevertheless, we have dedicated much time to this issue and although I can elaborate upon it more significantly, this much suffices those who have understanding and who are fair and balanced. Even if the narration of the gifting of Fadak and the narration of seeking witnesses are legitimate reports, then too Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه is pure from any criticism of any kind and he is completely innocent. In addition to this, the narration of *Minhāj al-Kirāmah* by Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī expresses that he did not die with the crime of usurping Fadak recorded against him. As for not seeking witnesses from Sayyidunā Jābir رضي الله عنه, this matter has been dealt with more than adequately.

A possible ijtihādī error

In addition to this, Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه was not infallible. He was after all a mujtahid and just like the Ambiyā' could err in Ijtihād a non-Nabī can also err.

1 The word *tawātur* (recurrence) is a mode of transmitting aḥādīth. Recurrence obtains when a ḥadīth is narrated through so many channels and by so many people that collusion upon forgery is deemed inconceivable (because of the assumption that such a large number of transmitters cannot find ways to conspire amongst themselves); knowledge engendered by this type is considered certain.

Consider the error in the Ijtihād of Nabī Dāwūd عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام and the correct Ijtihād of Nabī Sulaymān عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام as recorded in Sūrah al-Ambiyā'. On this basis, the Shīʿah could excuse him for his Ijtihād. Perhaps he erred in seeking testimony from Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا or he erred in excusing Sayyidunā Jābir رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. Considering that he has been praised by Allah and the Imāms, it demands that he not be criticised.

If this does not satisfy them and he cannot be excused, then the narration of *Minhāj al-Kirāmah* seals the matter. It states that when Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا admonished him he rectified his error and handed it over to her. Now everyone knows that one who repents from a sin after receiving admonishment is purified from his sin and it is deleted from his records. Therefore, he is not guilty and he cannot be punished. Even if he failed to repent, the verses in his favour establish that Allah has forgiven him.

If an infallible Imām can be under the sway of Shayṭān then Abū Bakr is excused as he is not infallible

However, the Ahl al-Sunnah have no problem attributing an error to Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, as they consider him on the rank of a Walī, not on the rank of a Nabī. It is the Shīʿah who have a serious problem. They ought to review the following words of Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn, which appear in *Ṣaḥīfah al-Kāmilah*. If the Imāms are infallible and above the clutches of Shayṭān, consider what Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ says:

> قد ملك الشيطان عناني في سوء الظن و ضعف اليقين و اني اشكوا سوء مجاورته لي و طاعة نفسي له
>
> Shayṭān has taken control of my reins and led me to unbecoming thoughts and weak conviction and I complain to you of his evil association with me and my succumbing to him.

Now consider that the Imām cannot lie. The Shīʿah would become disbelievers if they consider an Imām a liar. Nonetheless, he admits to succumbing to the promptings of Shayṭān and unlike Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ there is no verse guaranteeing his entry into Paradise. (The Shīʿah consider him *maʿṣūm* (infallible), and we consider him to be *maḥfūẓ* (protected). Similarly, the expressions 'unbecoming thoughts', 'weak conviction' and 'succumbing to him' cannot be disposed as ijtihādī errors, as the nature of the acknowledgement admits to grave errors.

Nahj al-Balāghah—a Shīʿī collection of the speeches of Sayyidunā ʿAlī—has similar admissions. In fact, the Qur'ān ascribes *Khaṭa'* (errors) to some of the Ambiyā'. The incidents of Nabī Adam عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام and Nabī Yūnus عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام are well-known. So, the error of mishandling the issue of Fadak, or usurping it as the Shīʿah claim is a trivial offence as Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was fallible unlike the above personalities.

O most benevolent Allah, you are aware of my deepest admiration and greatest reverence for Imām Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn, the illustrious Ahl al-Bayt and the Ambiyā'. You are aware that my words are being recorded here on the basis of the principle which states that relating kufr does not constitute kufr, nor render the one who has related it as a kāfir.

The Ḥadīth about the estate of the Ambiyā'

ʿAmmār ʿAlī states the following as he continues:

> **Similarly, when she realised that Abū Bakr had considered her claim false and she asked for it to be given to her as inheritance instead then Abū Bakr fabricated a ḥadīth which is in conflict with the Noble Qur'ān itself. He said that he heard the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ saying that the material possessions of the Ambiyā' should be disposed off as charity and none of it would be for their heirs. In addition to this narration contradicting the Qur'ān, the Prophet of Allah neither informed his daughter or any of his wives that his wealth would be disposed off in charity and they would have nothing of it, so they should not lay claims to it. How could the Messenger of Allah conceal this divine injunction from those concerned and reveal it to a stranger who has no one else to verify this report.**

ʿAmmār ʿAlī has had his say; now he should give us a hearing too. The early Shīʿī scholars criticise and curse Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ for not giving Fadak as inheritance to Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا. However, when they heard the response to their allegation from the Ahl al-Sunnah, then those who came later on fabricated the narration of Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا receiving Fadak as a gift. They made great attempts to succeed with this dubious narration and even managed to admit it into some unpopular Sunnī references. They also appeared in the garb of Sunnī scholars of ḥadīth and managed to transmit it to unwary seekers of ḥadīth. However, the trick failed because the signs of falsehood were glaring from this narration. The game was over for the fraudsters as they were sniffed out and the books which

they managed to admit this narration into were unpopular resources. In addition to the narration failing them, the truth that liars have a weak memory proved itself as they failed to realise that a gift or Hibah is incomplete and inconclusive if the beneficiary does not get control and possession. Similarly, a claim cannot be established by the testimony of one male and one female and two children.

Nevertheless, their plot failed miserably and Allah and His Messenger ﷺ were on the side of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه. Consequently, Allah stipulates two males or two females and one male for establishing any claim and the Prophet ﷺ retained administration of Fadak till the end of his life.

The Shīʿah were bent on leading themselves to destruction so they fabricated a narration stating that Fāṭimah was entitled to Fadak because the Prophet ﷺ had a made a bequest to this effect. But they forgot that a bequest is only valid in wealth that can be inherited and there is no question of inheriting the Prophet's ﷺ material possessions.

The Shīʿah were faced with a predicament now. They had no basis to condemn Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه and at the same time they had to fuel these allegations in order to appease their masses and to continue soliciting money and other benefits from them. If they lost hold of their masses how else would they receive a ḥarām share from the wealth of the deceased and enjoy *Niyāz* and offerings? The latter generations picked up the old allegations of their predecessors, gave it a new touch and kept the criticism and reviling of Ṣaḥābah aflame.

ʿAmmār ʿAlī has done precisely the same in his letter to Mīr Nādir. But he was a foolish thief and did not even know how to present the case correctly. Therefore, he says that ʿAlī and Umm Ayman bore witness and he adds Ḥasan and Ḥusayn to the drama. He also makes claims of Hibah and inheritance at the same time, and also implicates ʿUmar رضي الله عنه for tearing the document up. Nevertheless, he has made great attempts to give credibility to his falsehood but it seems as if he has not come up against his match from the Ahl al-Sunnah as yet. If he had had an encounter with a learned Sunnī, he would have forgotten all his ludicrous claims.

All praise belongs to Allah, the Ahl al-Sunnah are on firm, unshakeable foundations. Why would it not be so firm when it is nothing but the truth? Let alone the great

scholars among the Ahl al-Sunnah, this humble soul can also strike deadly blows at the Shīʿah and some of it has passed in the pages before you. Nevertheless, let us asses his claims and deal with it bit by bit. He says:

> When she realised that Abū Bakr had considered her claim false and she asked for it to be given to her as inheritance instead then Abū Bakr fabricated a ḥadīth which is in conflict with the Noble Qur'ān itself.

Honourable sir, a truthful and honest person acknowledges what is correct and we do not refute the fact that Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها did make a claim to receive the inheritance of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم. If we were concealing something, we would have erased this narration from our books. The fact that we acknowledge and document that she claimed inheritance is enough to convince those who are just that the narration of gifting Fadak to her is baseless. [Since we document and do not deny,] we are not like ʿAmmār ʿAlī who refutes the records of *Nahj al-Balāghah* and the *al-Kāfī* of al-Kulaynī which establish that Ruqayyah and Umm Kulthūm رضي الله عنهما were the daughters of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم.

No contradiction between Qur'ān and the Ḥadīth reported by Abū Bakr

However, the claim that this ḥadīth contradicts the Qur'ān is untrue. Those who are intelligent already understand by this statement the level of proficiency that the Shīʿah have as far as the Qur'ān is concerned. For a people who have no connection with the Book of Allah, how would they know what conforms to it and what contradicts it? But since we have to spell it out for them, let us commence by saying that this ḥadīth does not contradict the Qur'ān in any way. Not only does it conform to the Qur'ān, it embraces the Qur'ān.

But in order to understand this fully let us elaborate on the objection of it contradicting the Qur'ān in such a manner that would make the Shīʿah and their scholars grateful to us for it. After elaborating on the claim, we will respond adequately so that they may be shamed.

It must be stated though that ʿAmmār ʿAlī is fighting on the strength of others weapons; he has repeated whatever he has gained from here and there. He ought to have gathered the facts and presented his claim in a systematic fashion. Blurting established facts is surely not the art of debate. We could have simply responded by refuting all his claims and countering it with Sunnī beliefs, without even bothering

with the proofs and evidences for Sunnī beliefs. What would his response have been then? We would not respond in this manner, but we could have used the response of the Khawārij or the Nāṣibī for them. Consequently, we could have said that all the narrations about the merits of the Imāms and the right to being Imām along with all those narrations which forms the foundation of Shīʿah belief are but baseless, fabricated reports. What would ʿAmmār ʿAlī do then besides remaining silent and backing off?

But look at our kindness and fairness that we have undertaken to elaborate on the objection and state it in full and then respond to it.

The Shīʿī objection to this Ḥadīth

The Shīʿah have made great attempts to reject the ḥadīth—which is 'solely' transmitted by Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه—by asserting that it is in conflict with the Qur'ān. They say that if a ḥadīth contradicts the Qur'ān, even though it has profuse transmission, it has to be rejected according to the Sunnī principles of ḥadīth. In this case, the transmission is by one sole narrator so it is even more incumbent to discard this ḥadīth.

Consequently, they assert it to be in conflict with the Qur'ān due to the following: Firstly, the following verse establishes the right of inheritance for offspring and it stipulates two shares for male offspring and one share for female offspring.

يُوصِيكُمُ اللّٰهُ فِيْ أَوْلَادِكُمْ لِلذَّكَرِ مِثْلُ حَظِّ الْأُنْثَيَيْنِ

> *Allah instructs you all concerning your children: for the male, what is equal to the share of two females.*[1]

Therefore, just as the rules of Ṣalāh, Ḥajj, Zakāh, and other matters apply to the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم, the laws of inheritance apply to him as well. Therefore, the claim that the Prophet's صلى الله عليه وسلم wealth cannot be inherited is in conflict with this verse.

Secondly, the ḥadīth of Abū Bakr is in conflict with the following two verses as well:

فَهَبْ لِيْ مِنْ لَدُنْكَ وَلِيًّا يَرِثُنِيْ وَيَرِثُ مِنْ اٰلِ يَعْقُوْبَ

1 Sūrah al-Nisā': 11.

So, give me from Yourself an heir, who will inherit me and inherit from the family of Yaʿqūb.[1]

وَوَرِثَ سُلَيْمَانُ دَاوُوْدَ

And Sulaymān inherited Dāwūd.[2]

These two verses establish inheriting from Ambiyā'. The second of the two verses say that Nabī Sulaymān عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ inherited from Nabī Dāwūd عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ. The first verse records the prayer of Nabī Zakariyyā عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ. He said: "So give me from Yourself an heir, who will inherit me and inherit from the family of Yaʿqūb..."

Thus, the second verse is explicit and it says that Nabī Sulaymān عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ inherited from Nabī Dāwūd عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ. This establishes inheritance from a Nabī. The first verse is not explicit but it expresses the words of a Nabī regarding inheritance and he surely knew better than anyone else about the prayer he was making. Similarly, he was not reprimanded for his prayer like Nabī Nūḥ عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ. In fact, he received glad-tidings of the acceptance of his prayer and he was not admonished at all.

Nonetheless, these verses essentially establish inheritance from the Ambiyā'. Therefore, how could the statement of the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, "our estate is not inherited," be correct? According to some versions of this ḥadīth, he said:

لا نرث

We do not inherit.

This also seems incorrect as Nabī Sulaymān عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ inherited from Nabī Dāwūd عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ and Nabī Yaḥyā عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ was to inherit from Nabī Zakariyyā عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ.

So, this is the elaboration of the allegation of contradicting the Qur'ān which we have recorded in full, such as cannot be possibly articulated by any Shīʿī scholar.

Response

Consider our response to this, which is soothing to the ears and pleasing to the soul. Our response will dispel all notions of this ḥadīth even being in apparent

---

1 Sūrah Maryam: 5, 6.

2 Sūrah al-Naml: 16.

conflict with the Qur'ān let alone actual conflict. Before digesting the response, it is essential to clarify some preliminary issues.

Firstly, there is no doubt about the entire Qur'ān being the word of Allah, from beginning to end. This is why it is known as *Kalām Allāh*. However, just like messages and correspondence of human beings, the nature of the address in the Qur'ān is of two types. Let us consider human correspondence and then understand this in the context of the Qur'ān. Consider how a person writes a letter to another, or despatches his messages to another person via an emissary. In both cases, the wording is that of the writer or sender, but the emissary is just the intermediary for conveying that letter or message. If we apply this to the Qur'ān, the majority of it is like this. Allah's address is either to the entire ummah or specifically to the Prophet ﷺ or to both. Sometimes the address is directed to a specific group. There is no need to illustrate this with an example but lest the Shīʿah fail to get the message, the following examples illustrate this:

يَا عِبَادِ فَاتَّقُوْنِ

O My servants, then fear Me.[1]

يَا أَيُّهَا الرَّسُوْلُ

O Rasūl.[2]

يَا أَيُّهَا النَّبِيُّ

O Nabī.[3]

يَا بَنِيْ إِسْرَائِيْلَ اذْكُرُوْا نِعْمَتِيَ الَّتِيْ أَنْعَمْتُ عَلَيْكُمْ

O Banī Isrā'īl, remember My favour which I have bestowed upon you.[4]

Consequently, the first verse is an example of a general address (to all Allah's servants), the second and third is a specific address to the Prophet ﷺ and

1 Sūrah al-Zumar: 16.

2 Sūrah al-Mā'idah: 67.

3 Sūrah al-Aḥzāb: 59.

4 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 40.

the last is an address to the Banī Isrā'īl to remember the favours of Allah upon them. Nevertheless, in all the above instances, the wording and the meaning is from Allah; it is not relating anyone else's words.

The second example of human correspondence is like the case of a person who is ignorant of a certain language and he cannot convey his message personally. Therefore, a scribe converts his message into words and presents it on his behalf. In this instance, the message would be considered to be from the one who is ignorant of that language, though the words are not written by him.

Or take the scenario of a person who is directed by a lawyer to make certain remarks in a specific manner, the words emit from the person but they are actually the words of the lawyer.

In a similar manner, there are certain instances in the Qur'ān, which have been revealed by Allah, but it is understood that the reader of the Qur'ān is expressing those words by himself. Consider the wording and meanings of the chapters commonly referred to as the four '*Qul's*'. All other verses where '*Qul*' (say) or '*Qulū*' (all of you say) are other examples of this. In all these instances the content which follows '*Qul*' gives the impression that the speaker is the one who is addressing Allah with those words [yet the words have been inspired and revealed by Allah). In the case of Sūrah al-Falaq for example, the Prophet ﷺ is directed to say: "I seek refuge..."

However, when telling someone what to say it is imperative to tell them, "Say the following," but when handing a document for them to read, the command, "Say" would not feature. In the same way, certain verses in the Qur'ān are formulated in a manner that indicates that the person is addressing Allah with those words, or it is formulated in a way that gives the impression that the Prophet ﷺ is addressing (human beings on behalf of Allah.) In some cases, '*qul*' or '*qulū*' does not appear, but it can be likened to the document a lawyer gives the client with which he represents himself with; the instruction, 'Say' does not feature in it.

Sūrah al-Fātiḥah is a primary example of this, especially from

onwards, which means:

It is You we worship and You we ask for help. Guide us to the straight path, the path of those upon whom You have bestowed favour, not of those who have evoked [Your] anger or of those who are astray.

It is very obvious that Allah has formulated this text and handed it over to the servant so that he could express himself in that manner before his Rabb. It is impossible for it to be the prayer of Allah as He does not pray to anyone or seek guidance and assistance.

Evidence that the Prophet ﷺ is exempt from the Address in "Allah Instructs You Concerning Your Children."

Having established the above, it should be noted that the verse in question:

يُوْصِيْكُمُ اللّٰهُ فِيْ أَوْلَادِكُمْ لِلذَّكَرِ مِثْلُ حَظِّ الْأُنْثَيَيْنِ

Allah instructs you all concerning your children: for the male, what is equal to the share of two females.[1]

and in fact, the entire sūrah, has been revealed similar to Sūrah al-Fātiḥah. Allah has formulated the entire sūrah and handed it over to the Prophet ﷺ so that he could give instruction to people using the word of Allah, instead of his own words. The proof that this has been formulated on behalf of the Prophet ﷺ is the word *Yūsīkum Allāh* (Allah instructs you all). Consequently, Allah does not say:

يَا عِبَادِيْ اُوْصِيْكُمْ

O My servants, I instruct you.

Had this been Allah's direct address to his servants, he would have said the above. Nevertheless, the manner in which it is phrased proves that the Prophet ﷺ is the speaker (on behalf of Allah) and that his followers are being addressed by him. He is educating them about the laws of inheritance using the text formulated by Allah for this purpose. This is just like the clerk of the court reading out the judgement of the judge to the claimant or defendant and informing them of the judgment given in their respective case.

1 Sūrah al-Nisā': 11.

Therefore, since Allah does not say, "O My servants, I instruct you," it establishes that the Prophet ﷺ is proclaiming the message just as is the case with Sūrah al-Fātiḥah, where it is understood that each and every person standing in prayer or reciting it is expressing its contents.

Similarly, when the clerk reads out the judgement, it is understood that the judgement is not directed to him (i.e. the clerk). In the same way, the Prophet ﷺ should be considered to be excluded from the proclamation being made to his followers. Consequently, the ḥadīth, "What we leave behind is charity," has been expressed to highlight his exclusion from that proclamation. This is why this ḥadīth is actually the Tafsīr of this verse. The confounded Shīʿah misunderstand it to be a distortion of the verse and claim that there is contradiction between the Qur'ān and ḥadīth. They are ignorant, but they blame Abū Bakr رَضِيَٱللَّهُعَنْهُ.

Therefore, the Qur'ānic verse and the ḥadīth are in perfect harmony. In fact, the ḥadīth serves as the Tafsīr of the verse, which is the case with all the aḥādīth of the Ahl al-Sunnah for that matter.

Sometimes a ruler has an announcer proclaiming a new rule and it is understood from the nature of events that the one who is making the proclamation is also governed by that particular rule. Therefore, certain commands such as Ṣalāh, Zakāh, and Ḥajj are sometimes expressed in a tone, which according to the previous explanation demands the Prophet's ﷺ exclusion, but these apply to him as well on account of some other factors.

Nevertheless, since it has been established from this verse that the law of inheritance does not apply to the Prophet ﷺ, there was a possibility that some would fail to make the distinction and equate this to the commands of Ṣalāh, Fasting, and Ḥajj. Therefore, the Prophet ﷺ uttered the following statement:

> We the Ambiyā' are not inherited from, whatever we leave behind is charity.

Other examples of the Prophet's ﷺ exclusion

The fact that a different rule applies to the Prophet ﷺ is not peculiar to the case of inheritance. There are many other matters that are exclusively for the Prophet ﷺ. Consider the opening verses of Sūrah al-Muzammil and the following verse which make Tahajjud Ṣalāh mandatory upon the Prophet ﷺ

according to the majority view. However, Tahajjud Ṣalāh is not obligatory upon the ummah.

Similarly, fasting continuously without ifṭār was lawful for the Prophet ﷺ but prohibited for the Ummah. If a woman offered herself for marriage to the Prophet ﷺ, without the obligation of dowry, then it was permissible for him to accept her in marriage; but it is not permissible for the Ummah. Similarly, the Prophet ﷺ was excused from giving equal time to all his spouses but he maintained this throughout his life. The rest of the Ummah is bound to be equal in this regard.

Muslim men are permitted to have four wives, which appears at the beginning of this very sūrah. Consequently, the Ahl al-Sunnah and Shīʿah maintain that men can have four wives, not more. However, the Prophet ﷺ is excluded from this.

It seems that the reason for his exclusion from this command is the very same matter which we have already established and that is the tone in this sūrah is not a direct command from Allah, but a command given to the Prophet ﷺ to relay to the Ummah.

Similarly, the admonition in the opening verse of this sūrah should also be considered to be from the Prophet ﷺ. The verse is as follows:

يٰٓاَيُّهَا النَّاسُ اتَّقُوْا رَبَّكُمُ الَّذِىْ خَلَقَكُمْ مِّنْ نَّفْسٍ وَّاحِدَةٍ

O mankind, fear your Rabb, who created you from one soul.[1]

Had this been a direct statement and address from Allah, it would have read as follows:

يٰٓاَيُّهَا النَّاسُ اتَّقُوْانِيْ فَاِنِّيْ رَبَّكُمُ الَّذِىْ خَلَقَكُمْ

O mankind, **fear Me, for verily I am your** Rabb who created you...

Therefore, (from the opening verse), the address is from the Prophet ﷺ to the rest of the ummah. This is why the command of inheritance would be applicable to the Ummah. Consider when a nurse or care giver directs the patient to take medication or avoid certain foods because of the doctor's instruction, then those regulations do not apply to the caregiver too. The Prophet ﷺ is also in the

1 Sūrah al-Nisā': 1.

position of the caregiver for his Ummah and he has relayed the instructions of Allah—who is the Curer—to us. Consequently, the Prophet ﷺ relayed the contents of this sūrah and he was exempted from its regulations.

If any command is directed to the Prophet ﷺ then it is just like the doctor making a reference to something of relevance to the caregiver whilst giving instructions about the patient's prescription.

Therefore, we have established that the commands from the beginning of this sūrah till the end of the section on inheritance is expressed in relation to the Ummah. If the Prophet ﷺ is also intended in any command, then it is established by an external factor. And if not the entire sūrah, then surely till the end of the laws of inheritance, the text has been expressed in a manner that allows the Prophet ﷺ to convey it (as opposed to a direct injunction from Allah).

The exclusion of the Prophet ﷺ or certain rules being relaxed for him is a matter which has parallels in our mundane worldly affairs. Therefore, a military officer has certain privileges which a common soldier cannot have. Therefore, just as the Prophet ﷺ is exempted from the law stipulating four wives only, the Prophet ﷺ is not addressed by this law of inheritance. This implies that there is no conflict between the Qur'ān and the ḥadīth; instead they complement each other.

Rather, conflict and contradiction is that which stems from certain Shīʿī reports stating that some of the Imāms denied and deprived the other heirs from some of the belongings of their father and kept it to themselves, such as the sword, the ring, the copy of the Qur'ān and some garments. These narrations are recorded in Shīʿī references and the Ahl al-Sunnah have no record of these issues. So, on what basis was the inheritance denied or kept exclusively when the Qur'ān stipulates the law of inheritance in *Yūsīkum Allāh* (Allah instructs you all)?

Nevertheless, even if the ḥadīth of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه is incorrect or fabricated, its contents are accurate and correct. The law expressed in that ḥadīth would still apply to Fadak and other material possessions of the Prophet ﷺ and they would not be inherited. It is no longer necessary for us to record evidences why this ḥadīth is authentic, nor is it necessary to establish harmony between the ḥadīth and the Qur'ān.

But considering the fact that defending the chosen servants of Allah by defeating their enemies and silencing them would result in securing the favour of Allah, His Messenger ﷺ, and Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه—who is the greatest among the Awliyā'—we will oblige and record another reason why there is conformity between the ḥadīth and the Qur'ān. We would also give a response to the remaining verses which would be of benefit to those who are balanced and unbiased. We would then express why this ḥadīth is authentic and list the factors necessitating its authenticity, which is an issue contended by the Shīʿah.

A second dimension of conformity between Qur'ān and Ḥadīth

If the exclusion of the Prophet ﷺ was not established from the tone of the verse, *Yūsīkum Allāh* (Allah instructs you all) and the tone was such which indicated a general address, or if some dim-witted person claimed that the address was general; then too there is no difficulty in accepting the ḥadīth of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه to be authentic. If the ḥadīth is authentic it only qualifies the verse (serves as a *Mukhaṣṣiṣ*), it does not contradict it. Qualifying the verse shows that there is an exception, whereas opposing the verse means contradicting it and there is a difference between creating an exception and being in contradiction.

An example of creating an exception is as follows: A person says: "Everyone came to me except Zayd." Nobody considers this to be a contradiction (though he used the word "everyone" initially). However, when he says except Zayd, then the last part of the sentence qualifies the first part and creates an exception.

If somebody objects on account of the qualifying factor not accompanying the Qur'ānic verse as is the case with the example cited above; where the exclusion occurs in words alongside the statement, then we would say that it is not necessary for it to occur in words alongside the text. Consider that the exclusion of Zayd in the above example appears in words, but the exclusion of billions of other individuals is also implied without occurring in words. One often makes a remark of this nature, but the word "everyone"' has a very limited implication. It surely does not refer to all the people of the world. It may only refer to a small group, or the people of a little village or society. How is it that we understand and accept all these limitations in this speech without any reference to it in wording?

But if this example is not appealing to your understanding, then take another more concrete example. Allah سبحانه وتعالى says:

فَانْكِحُوْا مَا طَابَ لَكُمْ مِنَ النِّسَاءِ مَثْنٰى وَثُلَاثَ وَرُبَاعَ

Then marry those that please you of [other] women, two or three or four.[1]

Consequently, the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah among the Shīʿah are unanimous that four wives are the maximum for a Muslim male. So, if the command in *Yūsīkum Allāh* (Allah instructs you all) is general without exception then the command of *Fankiḥū* (then marry) is also general. Where is the exception for the Prophet ﷺ alongside it in explicit terms? Therefore, just as the Prophet ﷺ is considered exempt from it on account of other supporting texts, the same applies to *Yūsīkum Allāh* (Allah instructs you all); other texts establish his exemption.

If they say that the Prophet's ﷺ exclusion in the case of polygamy is established from a Qur'ānic verse in Sūrah al-Aḥzāb, which is as follows:

يَا أَيُّهَا النَّبِيُّ إِنَّا أَحْلَلْنَا لَكَ أَزْوَاجَكَ اللَّاتِيْ أٰتَيْتَ أُجُوْرَهُنَّ وَمَا مَلَكَتْ يَمِيْنُكَ مِمَّا أَفَاءَ اللّٰهُ عَلَيْكَ وَبَنَاتِ عَمِّكَ وَبَنَاتِ عَمَّاتِكَ وَبَنَاتِ خَالِكَ وَبَنَاتِ خَالَاتِكَ اللَّاتِيْ هَاجَرْنَ مَعَكَ وَامْرَأَةً مُؤْمِنَةً إِنْ وَهَبَتْ نَفْسَهَا لِلنَّبِيِّ إِنْ أَرَادَ النَّبِيُّ أَنْ يَسْتَنْكِحَهَا خَالِصَةً لَكَ مِنْ دُوْنِ الْمُؤْمِنِيْنَ قَدْ عَلِمْنَا مَا فَرَضْنَا عَلَيْهِمْ فِيْ أَزْوَاجِهِمْ وَمَا مَلَكَتْ أَيْمَانُهُمْ لِكَيْلَا يَكُوْنَ عَلَيْكَ حَرَجٌ وَكَانَ اللّٰهُ غَفُوْرًا رَحِيْمًا

O Nabī ﷺ, indeed We have made lawful to you your wives to whom you have given their due compensation and those your right hand possesses from what Allah has returned to you [of captives] and the daughters of your paternal uncles and the daughters of your paternal aunts and the daughters of your maternal uncles and the daughters of your maternal aunts who emigrated with you and a believing woman if she gives herself to the Nabī [and] if the Nabī wishes to marry her, [this is] only for you, excluding the [other] believers. We certainly know what We have made obligatory upon them concerning their wives and those their right hands possess, [but this is for you] in order that there will be upon you no discomfort. And ever is Allah Forgiving and Merciful.[2]

---

1 Sūrah al-Nisā': 3.

2 Sūrah al-Aḥzāb: 50.

Therefore, if the Prophet ﷺ was restricted to four wives then why did Allah list so many options of marriage for him? So just as this verse qualifies *Fankiḥū* (then marry) there should be a Qur'ānic verse qualifying *Yūsīkum Allah* (Allah instructs you all). Where is it?

We respond to this by saying that it is not necessary that a Qur'ānic verse qualifies the verse; this can also be accomplished by a ḥadīth. Since both are revelation, what is the difficulty in accepting this. But if they refuse to accept this, then we too reject that the verse Fankiḥū (then marry) is qualified by the verse they refer to. This is because when presenting something as evidence, then such evidence must be absolute and concrete, without other possibilities being entertained by it. Therefore, we say that the evidence is not absolute because *indeed We have made lawful* could be like the verse:

وَأُحِلَّ لَكُم مَّا وَرَاءَ ذٰلِكُمْ أَنْ تَبْتَغُوْا بِأَمْوَالِكُم مُّحْصِنِيْنَ غَيْرَ مُسَافِحِيْنَ

> *And lawful to you are [all others] beyond these, [provided] that you seek them [in marriage] with [gifts from] your property, desiring chastity, not unlawful sexual intercourse.*[1]

which simply lists the women one is allowed to contract marriage to on condition that dowry is given to them; it does not relate to number of wives. The fact that Sūrah al-Aḥzāb was revealed before Sūrah al-Nisā' (and the verse *Fankiḥū*) establishes this possibility about the implication of the verse of Sūrah al-Aḥzāb.

Consequently, in *al-Itqān* under the discussion about the sequence of sūrah revelation, there is a sound ḥadīth establishing this. Therefore, there was no revelation about limited polygamy (as the verse *Fankiḥū* establishes) when the verse, *indeed We have made lawful*, was revealed. When polygamy was not limited then the exclusion of the Prophet ﷺ has no relevance, it was still unlimited polygamy for all. Why reveal the verse (of Sūrah al-Aḥzāb) to establish what is known? Therefore, they are compelled to say that *Fankiḥū* (then marry) has been qualified by some other factor.

But if they contest this and say that the sequence of revelation may only apply to the opening verses of the sūrah and it does not necessarily establish that every verse

1 Sūrah al-Nisā': 24.

of Sūrah al-Aḥzāb was revealed before every verse of Sūrah al-Nisā’. Consequently, the ḥadīth of *al-Itqān* also gives some indication to this.

Well, this certainly does not silence us because it is not necessary for us to respond to all these possibilities. If they claim that Sūrah al-Nisā’ was revealed before Sūrah al-Aḥzāb, or if the particular verse of Nisā’, *Fankiḥū* (then marry), was revealed before *indeed We have made lawful* then they need to furnish evidence for it. Then only would their claim of Sūrah al-Aḥzāb qualifying the verse of Sūrah al-Nisā’ be correct.

Yūsīkum Allāh is qualified by another verse

We are not short of answers because the verse, *Allah instructs you all*, is qualified by another Qur’ānic verse of Sūrah al-Ḥashr, and Sūrah al-Ḥashr according to the ḥadīth of *al-Itqān* was revealed after Sūrah al-Nisā’. Consider the following verse:

مَا أَفَاءَ اللّٰهُ عَلَىٰ رَسُوْلِهِ مِنْ أَهْلِ الْقُرَىٰ فَلِلّٰهِ وَلِلرَّسُوْلِ وَلِذِيْ الْقُرْبَىٰ وَالْيَتَامَىٰ وَالْمَسَاكِيْنِ وَابْنِ السَّبِيلِ كَيْ لَا يَكُوْنَ دُوْلَةً بَيْنَ الْأَغْنِيَاءِ مِنْكُمْ وَمَا آتَاكُمُ الرَّسُوْلُ فَخُذُوْهُ وَمَا نَهَاكُمْ عَنْهُ فَانْتَهُوْا وَاتَّقُوْا اللّٰهَ إِنَّ اللَّهَ شَدِيْدُ الْعِقَابِ

And what Allah restored to His Rasūl from the people of the towns, it is for Allah and for the Rasūl and for [his] near relatives and orphans and the [stranded] traveller; so that it will not be a perpetual distribution among the rich from among you. And whatever the Rasūl has given you, take; and what he has forbidden you, refrain from. And fear Allah; indeed, Allah is severe in penalty.[1]

Now to all the ʿUlamā’ of the Ahl al-Sunnah and balanced Shīʿī, it is evident that Allah has stipulated six shares from the wealth of al-Fay’. Consequently, some maintain that the share of Allah must be spent on the Bayt Allāh and Masājid. However, the majority maintain that the wealth of al-Fay’ has five recipients only; it should be divided into five shares.

However, since the text *for Allah and for the Rasūl* which appears here appears exactly in the same manner in the opening verse of the tenth juz’, under the recipients

1 Sūrah al-Ḥashr: 6.

of khums, and the Shīʿah consider it as five recipients there, so it would be the same five recipients here too in the verse of Sūrah al-Ḥashr. In this case, the *for Allah* would mean that wealth which is dispensed according to the command of Allah and to the recipients designated by Allah. Since the wealth was given for the cause of Allah, it is referred to as *Lillāh*. Since the recipients have been stipulated by Allah, it is also called *Lillāh*.

Nevertheless, *for Allah* means that wealth belongs to Allah and it must be given to certain people for the pleasure of Allah. The reason for referring to Fay' as the wealth of Allah is that Fay' is such booty which comes into the hands of Muslims simply on account of the awe of the Muslim army, or by a peace treaty. Therefore, Allah has handed over such wealth by his grace to the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and the army did not engage in any battle prior to it.

But since the awe of the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ was augmented by the large army of the Ṣaḥābah, some of them could have desired a share of the Fay'. Subsequently Allah informed them that since their efforts were not utilised and that Allah had granted it to the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ as a bonus, therefore it was better to leave that wealth to be distributed according to the decree of Allah to the recipients cited in the aforementioned verse.

Whilst the words to *His Rasūl* establish the rights of the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ over it *for Allah* qualifies this, and clarifies that the Prophet's صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ administration is not on account of his *milkiyyat* (ownership), rather it is on account of him being given custody over it (become its *mutawallī*). Therefore, he was the treasurer and caretaker, not the owner and possessor. If he was the sole owner, then why were others allotted shares in it?

If we assume for a moment that the Fay' is the sole property of the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and that stipulating a share for the recipients is like how a portion of zakāh is claimed from the affluent person's wealth, then even though this assumption is negated by the wording of this Qur'ānic verse, it would imply, Allah forbid, that the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ left this world without discharging his obligation to the aforementioned recipients (since he did not allocate or demarcate their share of it). Such an implication can only be entertained by the Shīʿah. The Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ could not have been relieved simply by spending from its revenue on the specified recipients because the phrasing of the verse, *And what Allah restored*, shows that

they have a tangible share of the Fay' itself over and above its revenue. Therefore, we cannot entertain the possibility of the Prophet's ﷺ ownership.

In the light of the above repercussions one fails to understand how the Shīʿah fabricated the ḥadīth of gifting Fadak to Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها, or how do they adopt the view of his biological heirs being entitled to it solely. In fact, they consider Sayyidah Fāṭimah's رضي الله عنها exclusive entitlement to it and criticise the Ṣaḥābah in general and the three Khulafā' specifically. If they perpetrated this error on account of ignorance, then what is the delay in repenting and making amends now?

Yes, if we assume that Fadak did not come into the Prophet's ﷺ possession as Fay' (but in some other manner), or that Fadak was the piece leftover exclusively for the Prophet ﷺ after having designated the balance of the land for the stated recipients, then their claim could have had merit. But ask them who can contest that Fadak was received as Fay' or that it was not a dissected or cut up piece of land left for the Prophet ﷺ?

The idea of Fadak being the legal share of the Prophet ﷺ from the rest of the lands does not work out for the Shīʿah anyway. This is because if many settlements were received on account of a truce with each different group then each settlement has to be dissolved between the recipients individually due to the manner in which the verse is phrased.

If some obstinate Shīʿah decided to reverse the claim and instead say that Fadak was the fifth [khums] share which the Prophet ﷺ received as booty; it was not Fay' then the same issues arise once again. This is because the verse which establishes the Prophet's ﷺ share of the Fay' along with the remaining four recipients appears in the same format in Sūrah al-Tawbah regarding khums. If they have any doubts about my statement on account of their ignorance of the Qur'ān, then copies of the Qur'ān are readily available for them to review.

Added to this is the fact that khums is the share from booty or spoils of war. So, if Fadak was booty that was received after a battle then the Prophet ﷺ (along with the four recipients) is only entitled to khums, one-fifth, and the remaining is the share of the soldiers. Therefore, there is no way the Prophet ﷺ could have had ownership of the complete Estate of Fadak.

It is also not possible that Fadak refers to the leftover portion of the Estate which was solely for the Prophet ﷺ since historians and the author of al-Qāmūs are

unanimous about the definition of Fadak. Actually, the Shīʿah also cannot dispute this. Therefore, the possibility of Fadak referring to the specific portion of the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ from that Estate is null and void. It is likewise impossible to say that the Fay' or khums estates belonged solely to the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.

Fay' — not sole ownership

There may be some who still dispute that Fay' belonged to the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and that the other recipients can be likened to the obligation of zakāh upon one's wealth. Despite this interpretation not being supported by the verse, the word *for Allah* clearly establishes that the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ does not enjoy sole ownership.

Secondly, if *what Allah restored to His Rasūl* already denotes the Prophet's صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ ownership, then what is the purpose of saying *for the Rasūl*? Then instead of this, Allah could have phrased this verse and the verse of khums as follows without adding *for the Rasūl* to it, as follows:

فَلِلّٰهِ وَلِذِي الْقُرْبٰى

If someone says that ownership is not established from *what Allah restored to His Rasūl*, instead, it is established from *for Allah and for the Rasūl*, then this is more foolish than the first suggestion. This is because if the *Lām* in *Li l-Rasū* (for the Rasūl) establishes ownership, then the same *Lām* appears in *Li Dhī al-Qurbā* (for the near relatives), etc. This implies that prior to it being received as Fay' it was not in the ownership of the stated recipients (including Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ) and it only came into their possession after it was made over to the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.

Consequently, prior to being handed over, it was in the possession of the kuffār and their control over it was legal and valid. Similarly, if they embraced Islam or accepted the jizyah, it would have remained in their custody. Therefore, the Fay' was previously owned by kuffār (and according to their suggestion, it then came into the ownership of Allah and the other recipients after it was handed to the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ).

Similarly, if *Lām* denotes ownership, then the *Fā*, which is for *Taʿqīb* (elucidation), implies that Allah was not the owner of this prior to that and this can only be entertained by the Shīʿah. The meaning of *Fā* is that it was initially in the ownership

of someone [i.e. kuffār] and thereafter it came into the ownership of Allah. And since two owners cannot have complete ownership over one item at the same time, it creates this impossible situation of saying that Allah had no ownership of it prior to giving it to the Prophet ﷺ.

This absurdity can only occur if the nature of Allah's ownership and the nature of the kuffār ownership is considered the same. However, if the Shīʿah assume the stance of the Muʿtazilah in this matter—who declare the human being the Creator of his voluntary actions and equate Him to Allah in this respect—then who can restrain them from such folly? Therefore, if they consider the nature of the ownership of the Creator and the creation to be equal, then who could restrict them? As for the Ahl al-Sunnah, they consider Allah the actual owner whilst His creation has been given temporary administration over it and there is harmony between sole ownership and temporary administration, unlike sole ownership being declared for both the Creator and the creation.

If we dismiss the above implication which rises from the Shīʿī interpretation and embrace the Sunnī concept of ownership and temporary administration, then what about the temporary administration given to the other recipients, which is a result of considering the *Lām* for *tamlīk* (ownership). This would imply that all the stated recipients enjoy temporary administration.

Another interpretation

If they say that *Dhū al-Qurbā* (near relative) is attached to *for the Rasūl* and these two then combine and become attached on Allah, then the meaning is still distorted. This would mean that Fay' is equally owned between Allah and between His Rasūl and the other recipients. This meaning cannot be entertained by any Muslim as it demands that just as booty is distributed among the participants in battle, Fay' also ought to have been distributed among the stated recipients thereby according them the liberty to do as they please.

So, who is to bear the blame for the recipients not receiving their share in the manner stated above? Let alone the Prophet ﷺ, the Ahl al-Sunnah cannot even entertain such a shortcoming on the part of his Ṣaḥābah. The Shīʿah, however, do not have any difficulty in levelling such accusations and making these allegations. One who scans their resources will unearth far worse accusations than this.

Similarly, if the distribution were to be made then another problem arises. In the case of booty, the participants in battle are limited and known. As for the relatives, poor, destitute and wayfarer; their numbers are unknown and giving each one their share is impossible. Sharing the actual land between them all is unfathomable and even distributing its revenue to all as required is beyond the capacity of anyone.

Therefore, the revenue of Fadak did not reach each and every wayfarer, destitute and needy person, neither in the era of the Prophet ﷺ nor in the era of Sayyidunā ʿAlī رضي الله عنه. If we limit the revenue to those among these four recipients who are Muslim only, then too it is a task that can never be accomplished.

A third interpretation

If we assume that *For Allah* in this verse establishes absolute ownership of Allah, *For the Rasūl* refers to temporary ownership and administration of the Prophet ﷺ and *for the near relatives* till the end, lists the beneficiaries and recipients then the Ahl al-Sunnah would have no difficulty with this assumption except that it would have negative implications for Allah as will be explained shortly.

Firstly, the Prophet ﷺ enjoys no exclusive ownership, it is just referred to as his ownership (as the beneficiaries are stipulated). Therefore, if his so-called ownership is transferred and inherited by his heirs, then his heirs cannot be entitled to the share of the beneficiaries too. If the share of the beneficiaries must be transferred, then it must go to the heirs of those who were its beneficiaries during his blessed lifetime.

This clarifies the reason for Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه denying Fāṭimah's رضي الله عنها request as she requested sole possession of it and she did not ask for administration of its affairs as the Prophet ﷺ was instructed to administrate it. Therefore, the claim of Hibah or inheritance results in the rights of the remaining beneficiaries being trampled. The narration from *Misbāḥ al-Sālikīn*—some of which has appeared previously—bears ample testimony to this. Therefore, if it were not for requesting sole rights to it why would Sayyidunā Abū Bakr refuse Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها to administrate its affairs in a legitimate way. Why would he excuse himself by saying that he had seen the Prophet ﷺ adopting a certain course with Fadak and he was bound to do the same.

Those who are genuine accept the truth even if is against them. So, when Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها realised the truthfulness and veracity of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه, she was satisfied with his decision and his administration. This appears in the narration of *Misbāḥ al-Sālikīn*.

If the Shīʿah cannot accept this, it proves their displeasure with Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها and that they, falsely, use the Ahl al-Bayt to incite enmity against the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم.

The trouble with giving the Lām multiple connotations

The above explanation is given in the light of *Lām* denoting absolute ownership for Allah, temporary administration for the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم and listing beneficiaries. This explanation suits us fine and accordingly Sayyidunā Abū Bakr administrated Fadak after the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم and gave what was due to Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها.

However, this consolation from the Ahl al-Sunnah will not really help the Shīʿah too much. What about all the other problems this interpretation creates? Firstly, if Allah really wanted to give ownership to his beloved Rasūl صلى الله عليه وسلم, then why make it so complicated that other beneficiaries are inextricably wound up with it? Secondly, the miraculous eloquence of the Qur'ān remains unchallenged in even a short sūrah like al-Kawthar. But if we accept this interpretation, then the Qur'ān loses its miraculous eloquence because the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم receives ownership but he is denied of sole discretion and authority over what has been given to him. Similarly, (the multiple and diverse connotations of *Lām*) is something which is hard to accept. Instead, the opposite of that interpretation appears to be valid and nobody has perhaps elaborated on this impossible interpretation as I have.

Thirdly, if the *Lām* of *Fa li l-lāh* (for Allah) cannot be for *tamlīk* (granting ownership), simply because *tamlīk* could only occur when there was no ownership prior to that, which cannot be so in the case of Allah, then this is acceptable. Then would the same be said about the *Lām* in *Dhū al-Qurbā*, etc. Surely these other recipients cannot be on par with Allah having perpetual and absolute ownership since ever.

Fourthly, if the ownership of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم is like the ownership which humans have over their possessions then the link between the words demands the same type of ownership for the other beneficiaries too. But if the ownership of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم is distinct like the ownership that Allah has, then just as how

there is no inheritance in the possessions of Allah, there ought to be no inheritance in the possessions of the Prophet ﷺ.

Reasons why the Prophet's ﷺ possessions cannot be inherited

Considering the second alternative, there are two factors supporting the notion that the Prophet's ﷺ possessions cannot be inherited. Firstly, the Prophet ﷺ and every other Nabī of Allah is alive in his grave and a living person's ownership does not terminate over his possessions. Just like how a person remains absent from his family for a period and they distribute his belongings, it remains his and he has every right over it. Their ownership is not established by distributing it amongst themselves. the Prophet ﷺ also remains confined to his grave and none can have ownership of his possessions. This is the reality behind the ḥadīth transmitted by Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه but the Shīʿah cannot understand.

If the Shīʿah dispute this and disagree to the fact that the Prophet ﷺ is alive in his grave then there is a second factor which is as follows: On account of the great insight into realities which the Prophet ﷺ had, he realised the absolute ownership of Allah over everything all the time. He never considered anything to truly belong to him. This is just like how someone is invited for meals at another person's home. He considers the food presented to him as being the possessions of the host, which he has been allowed to benefit from him according to his requirements. He has no authority to do as he pleases or take it away from the home for his dependants just as he has no authority over any of the furniture or decor of the home. If he had any degree of authority over it, it would not have been considered a flaw if he were to take it home or do anything else with it.

The Ambiyā' also consider what has come into their possession in a similar manner. They consider such possessions to be in the actual ownership of Allah and that they have been allowed to benefit just as the guest helps himself to what is offered to him. Since they maintain that they have no real ownership and that it has been loaned to them, they maintain that their heirs have no entitlement to it. This is why the Prophet ﷺ said:

لا نورث ما تركنا صدقة

We (the Ambiyā') are not inherited from, what we leave behind is Ṣadaqah.

Dispelling the misconception

If the possession of the Ambiyā’ is really not theirs on the basis of the above, then this would imply that their selling or purchasing any item should not be valid. It requires someone very foolish to assume this because in this world also we see that when there is a relationship of attachment and love between two people, then the one allows the other to sell his or her possessions if the need arises for him to do so. When there is a very close relationship between two people then permission is not required to do as one wishes, what then can be said about Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ and the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ based on the relationship between them. Therefore, one has free reign over the possessions of another, but despite this one would not consider oneself the owner or feel that one’s heirs should be entitled to inherit it.

Consequently, the intimate understanding of realities compels the Ambiyā’ to consider sole ownership of everything to Allah all the time, even in that which is given for their temporary disposal. They utilise of it as per requirements without considering themselves entitled to it at any time.

All humans besides the Ambiyā’—despite their perfections and merits—cannot be on par with the Ambiyā’ in this perception. The comparison between the Ambiyā’ and normal people is like the comparison between children and elderly, wise people, or like the comparison between sane and insane people. Therefore, when a child or a fool gets control over an item that belongs to another person, they consider it to be theirs. If someone tries to draw it away from the child, the child throws a tantrum and gives a fight. This reaction from the child sometimes compels the owner to release ownership to the child.

Similarly, ordinary humans consider themselves the sole owners of material belongings which actually belong to Allah, but are given to them on a temporary basis. They may verbally acknowledge that everything belongs to Allah, but the attachment of their heart to it tells a different story.

If someone—in resembling the Ambiyā’—really feels that it belongs to Allah, then firstly his perception cannot be as genuine as the perception of the Ambiyā’. Secondly, how would anyone else be convinced about this truly being his inner state? Therefore, it cannot be said that his wealth should not be inherited like the wealth of the Ambiyā’.

The summary of this discussion is that the ownership of the Ambiyā’ is just like the ownership of Allah, wherein inheritance is not established. If somebody feels that this discussion on the possession of the Ambiyā’ is biased, then so be it; there are other reasons why inheritance is not established in the possessions of the Ambiyā’ and this still creates a problem for those who claim that inheritance must be established. Similarly, if *for the Rasūl* establishes the Prophet’s ﷺ superficial ownership only, it does not have any negative impact for the Ahl al-Sunnah, but does this interpretation really make sense? Therefore, the *Lām* in *li l-Rasūl* (for the Rasūl) and in *li Dhī al-Qurbā* (for the ear relatives) cannot establish *milkiyyāt* (ownership) and *istiḥqāq* (entitlement) in the same manner as the *Lām* in

لِلذَّكَرِ مِثْلُ حَظِّ الْأُنْثَيَيْنِ

For the male, what is equal to the share of two females.[1]

and

فَلَكُمْ رُءُوْسُ أَمْوَالِكُمْ

You may have your principal amount.[2]

respectively.

What Does the Lām Denote Then?

If we say that the function of the *Lām* is to list the beneficiaries as is the case with the following verse, then even the Shīʿah are compelled to accept this interpretation because it appeals to the intellect. Such as in the verse:

إِنَّمَا الصَّدَقَاتُ لِلْفُقَرَاءِ وَالْمَسَاكِيْنِ وَالْعَامِلِيْنَ عَلَيْهَا وَالْمُؤَلَّفَةِ قُلُوْبُهُمْ وَفِيْ الرِّقَابِ وَالْغَارِمِيْنَ وَفِيْ سَبِيْلِ اللّٰهِ وَابْنِ السَّبِيْلِ فَرِيْضَةً مِنَ اللّٰهِ

Zakāh expenditures are only for the poor and for the needy and for those employed to collect [zakāh] and for bringing hearts together [for Islam] and for freeing captives [or slaves] and for those in debt and for the cause of Allah and for the [stranded] traveller, an obligation [imposed] by Allah.[3]

---

1 Sūrah al-Nisā’: 11.

2 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 279.

3 Sūrah al-Tawbah: 60.

But if they lack intelligence and do not understand, then let them consider the function of *Lām* in the verse of Sūrah al-Anfāl, i.e. the verse of khums:

وَاعْلَمُوا أَنَّمَا غَنِمْتُم مِّن شَيْءٍ فَأَنَّ لِلَّهِ خُمُسَهُ وَلِلرَّسُولِ وَلِذِي الْقُرْبَىٰ وَالْيَتَامَىٰ وَالْمَسَاكِينِ وَابْنِ السَّبِيلِ

And know that anything you obtain of war booty, then indeed, for Allah is one fifth of it and for the Rasūl and for [his] near relatives and the orphans, the needy, and the [stranded] traveller.[1]

This *Lām* is for listing beneficiaries according to their scholars too. This is affirmed by Abū al-Qāsim referred to as *Al-Muḥaqqiq*—who is the author of *Sharā'iʿ al-Islām*. Other Imāmiyyah scholars also concur with this. In fact, this is transmitted from the Imāms too.

Beneficiaries do not have ownership of anything before it is given to them just like how a destitute or needy person has no authority over zakāh prior to receiving it.

Nevertheless, since the *Lām* is not for *milkiyyah* or *istiḥqāq*—but rather for listing beneficiaries—it explains why the Prophet ﷺ always distributed from the revenue to the beneficiaries but he did not distribute the actual land and allot shares for the respective recipients. But if the *Lām*—which appears before the recipients—denoted *milkiyyah* and *istiḥqāq* then the Prophet ﷺ would have had to distribute the actual land because that is primarily the Fay', not the income or revenue thereof. This fact requires no further clarification.

Objection from the Shīʿah

If they accept that the beneficiary has no prior ownership over what he has received but the words *Mā Afā' Allāh* (what Allah restored) demand that the Prophet ﷺ distribute the actual land among the recipients, and not its revenue. This humble scholar would say to them that the Ahl al-Sunnah would give a logical explanation to this too, but let the Shīʿah consider for a moment whom they are criticising. This criticism does not fall on the Ahl al-Sunnah; it targets the Prophet ﷺ directly.

1 Sūrah al-Anfāl: 40.

As for the Ahl al-Sunnah—on account of our īmān in the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ—we blindly accept his actions to be correct even if there is no evidence for it. But considering that we have laboured so intensely to defend the honour of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهُ and the rest of the Ṣaḥābah, why would we not defend the honour of the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ?

Therefore, if out of enmity and hatred for the Ṣaḥābah, the Shīʿah deem it appropriate to level criticism against the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ by saying that the verse does not advocate distribution of revenue to the beneficiaries. It actually requires distribution of the land and if this is so, why did the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ not do so? Had he distributed it, he would have had sole ownership of a chunk of it and Sayyidah Fāṭimah's رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهَا claim of inheritance to this piece of Fadak would have been valid. Similarly, this would not implicate Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهَا—who is infallible according to the Shīʿah. She is implicated by seeking inheritance in something which actually did not belong to her father. Therefore, instead of Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهَا, this had led to Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهَا being criticised whilst she is infallible.

Similarly, if an owner of an item [i.e. Allah] hands it over to one person and entrusts him with the task of distributing it between himself and the rest of the beneficiaries, then even though he has not distributed it, he has no entitlement to the share that would have been, had the distribution taken place. This is because the Ahl al-Sunnah and Shīʿah maintain that Hibah to multiple beneficiaries in one item does not accord anyone ownership unless *qabḍ* (taking possession) occurs and qabḍ cannot occur without distribution taking place. Therefore, the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ had *qabḍ* till the end of his life (without distribution). So, if any of the other recipients cannot have ownership prior to *qabḍ*, then the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ had *qabḍ* (without distribution) over the whole Fay', including his portion. This establishes that his ownership cannot be finalised whereupon the claim of inheritance from Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهَا could be entertained.

Nevertheless, the Shīʿah have two objections against the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ for distributing its revenue and not the actual land. Firstly, his actions are in conflict with the verse. Secondly, it has become difficult for them to retain the claim of Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهَا being infallible on account of his not effecting distribution of the land.

We are now compelled to respond and defend the honour of the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيۡهِ وَسَلَّمَ. Perhaps it will secure us a good position in the hereafter and it will silence the Shīʿah forever.

Fay' is actually Waqf — not personal ownership

Before proceeding, the Shīʿah out of hindsight level such objections which are detrimental to their own faith without tarnishing the image of the Ahl al-Sunnah in any way. Nevertheless, *what Allah restored* appears as *Jumlah Ismiyyah* (a nominal sentence). In eloquent expression, *Jumlah Ismiyyah* denotes constancy and perpetuity (i.e. dawām and thubūt). This demands the perpetual attachment of the recipients which are Allah, His Rasūl, Dhū al-Qurbā, etc., to it. The perpetual relationship between the two can only be envisaged if Fay' is classified as Waqf. In other words, Waqf remains forever in the ownership of Allah and the beneficiaries benefit from it perpetually.

Difference between Ṣadaqāt and Fay'

Whilst the same Jumlah Ismiyyah occurs in the verse:

إِنَّمَا الصَّدَقَاتُ لِلْفُقَرَاءِ وَالْمَسَاكِيْنِ

Zakāh expenditures are only for the poor and for the needy.

there is a difference between Ṣadaqah and Fay' for those who understand. Giving Ṣadaqah is an instant action and there is no perpetuity to the action. It terminates just as rapidly as it commenced. Therefore, prior to releasing it, it is not classified as charity. Had it been charity before it was dispensed all the promises of Allah for giving charity ought to apply, such as being entitled to rewards, discharging one's obligation, cooling the wrath of anger of Allah, etc. Similarly, after being received by the needy, it again loses its classification as Ṣadaqah. Therefore, if the needy person then entertains a wealthy person or a Sayyid with it, it is considered valid and permissible. Therefore, the wealth of Ṣadaqah is only classified as such in the moment when the exchange takes place, not prior to it and not after that.

Nevertheless, *what Allah restored* denotes perpetuity but (in philosophical terms) perpetuity arises only when the subject remains forever attached to the predicate. However, it is not anyone's task to identify the actual subject in each situation.

This requires in-depth understanding and insight, which is divinely conferred to whomsoever Allah wills.

Therefore, in *what Allah* restored the actual subject is the word Mā (what), which is a reference to Fay' lands. As for the word *Afā'* (restored), it is for clarification and dispelling ambiguity. Therefore, *for Allah* onwards [and the rest of the recipients] will remain forever attached to it. In philosophical terms, this is known as *Qadhiyyah Da'imah* (perpetual relationship). Having understood this, it is evident that the Prophet's ﷺ action was in conformance with this verse.

Infallibility of Fāṭimah

As for Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها being infallible and such a gesture impacting on her infallibility, it should be known that the Ahl al-Sunnah do not entertain this belief about a non-Nabī. Similarly, in the discussion on the verse of Sūrah al-Fatḥ, we have explained how an infallible can have a misunderstanding and fallible human can have the correct perception. There are numerous other instances of this which appear in the Qur'ān and Sunnah. The example of Nabī Dāwūd عليه السلام passing judgement which was not as accurate as that of Nabī Sulaymān عليه السلام, who was not yet a Nabī, or an Imām as Shīʿī terminology requires. But if the Shīʿah do not know the contents of the Qur'ān then it is not our fault.

Consequently, the objection levelled by the Shīʿah towards the Ahl al-Sunnah for following such leaders who are fallible and can err is just like the case of a blind person saying that the sun has no light and him saying that there is no vision in his eyes. So, this allegation of the Shīʿah does not show any shortcoming in the Ahl al-Sunnah; it actually depicts the weak mental aptitude of the Shīʿah.

Third evidence that the Prophet ﷺ did not have ownership of Fay'

A third evidence that the Prophet ﷺ did not own Fadak and that the stipulation of beneficiaries was not like the injunction of zakāh from one's wealth. This proof is so adequate that it dispels any objection about why Fadak itself was not distributed. It is as follows: The revenue of land is either through its fruits or crop harvest. Consequently, the trees and crops are indirectly part of the land. This is just like how prior to plucking the fruit from a tree, the tree and the fruit on it are referred to collectively as a tree and prior to harvesting the crop the land

is referred to as land even though it has crops on it. In a similar way, *what Allah restored* also refers to the revenue of the land.

But just as how a crop has seeds and husk for example, it is then shared between human beings and cattle. in the same way, there is a partnership between Allah and the recipients in the Fay' lands, each receiving what is suitable for him because Allah has stipulated his share in the verse along with the other recipients. Therefore, since Allah is independent of food and drink, and human beings are dependent the distribution will be accordingly. The words *fuqarā'* (poor) and *masākīn* (orphans) inherently convey this meaning of dependency. The word Rasūl [also listed as a recipient] conveys the meaning of need and dependency too. Consider that the office of Nubuwwah is such an onerous responsibility that it hardly leaves any time for mundane tasks. Therefore, the Prophet ﷺ remained devoted to his task of conveying the message till he was called back by Allah. Consequently, the Prophet's ﷺ lack of material resources is evident from the word "Rasūl" itself and since he was devoted to the cause of Allah he has been listed as the first recipient.

Nevertheless, it is evident that listing all these beneficiaries in the Fay' is on account of their need. Therefore, the distribution would be as follows: The fruits and crops—which are essentially part of the land—along with the land itself would be what is referred to as *what Allah restored*. The ownership of the actual land will remain for Allah but its revenue would be distributed to the recipients due to their need.

This explanation dispels the possibility of the Prophet ﷺ having ownership of the Fay' lands and the recipients being added to it like the purpose of zakāh in one's wealth. It also dispels the objection of not distributing the actual land among the recipients.

Fourth evidence that the Prophet ﷺ did not have ownership of Fay'

Ready yourself for the fourth proof now so that any doubts that remains in the heart can be completely wiped out. The verse, *what Allah restored*, has its recipients outlined, in which there is also mention of the Prophet ﷺ. However, this does not necessitate ownership of the Prophet ﷺ because if we assume that there was ownership then the outcome (*Jazā*) which is found after the condition (*Sharṭ*) as established by the letter *fa* would be general in all the recipients resulting

in complete ownership to all the recipients in all the categories. Since, this is not so, as agreed upon by both the Sunnī and the Shīʿah, there is no reason to restrict it to only one or two of the categories of the recipients mentioned. Thus, there is no possibility of understanding the verse in a way that singles out only one or two categories for ownership. Yes, the infallibility of the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ meant he would be the one to divide it; however, this does not mean he had ownership of it. On the other hand, if every category mentioned—besides Allah which is evident—are considered mere recipients (*Maṣārif*) then it would make perfect sense.

If indeed the issue was one of ownership, then the verse would have been revealed in the following manner, **For the Rasūl, for Allah, and for the near relatives**, thus establishing ownership to the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ prior to mentioning the recipients. Sure, the eloquence of the Qur'ān would have then been compromised but then ownership of the fay' by the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ would have been guaranteed.

Fifth evidence that the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ did not have ownership of Fay'

The fifth evidence is that the personal pronoun in:

كَيْ لَا يَكُوْنَ دُوْلَةً بَيْنَ الْأَغْنِيَاءِ مِنْكُمْ

So that it will not be a perpetual distribution among the rich from among you.[1]

refers to *what Allah has restored*. Therefore, the stipulation of beneficiaries is to avoid a situation where the lands of Fay' become privately owned wealth. This can only be possible if we consider the stated recipients as permanent beneficiaries to the Fay'. If it is considered the Prophet's صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ personal possession, then that which was being averted would inevitably come to pass. This is because if the direct descendants who inherited it initially were not affluent then the system of Allah is such that affluence or poverty is not retained perpetually in any family. Therefore, if this land were inherited then in the subsequent generation's ownership of it could come into the hands of wealthy and affluent ones.

However, confining *the rich* to rulers or affluent ones among an army has no substantiation. Yes, if this verse listing the beneficiaries was revealed to break the hopes of wealthy army officials or rulers of the era of ignorance—who consumed

1 Sūrah al-Ḥashr: 7.

all the booty themselves—then too the command in the verse is all-encompassing, though the situation for which the verse was revealed maybe somewhat specific. Consequently, there are hundreds of examples where a situation or incident demanded the revelation of a verse or a prophetic injunction, but the ruling was general and applicable for all. Therefore, *the rich* have to have broad connotations.

Sixth evidence that the Prophet ﷺ did not have ownership of Fay’

The beneficiaries listed in this verse, have been listed by their predominant characteristic. The Prophet ﷺ has been referred to by his position as a Rasūl, the needy, destitute and the wayfarer have been referred to with those specific characteristics as well (i.e. need, destitution, and travelling). There is no mention of identities of individuals.

This verse is then followed by the verse:

لِلْفُقَرَآءِ الْمُهٰجِرِيْنَ الَّذِيْنَ اُخْرِجُوْا مِنْ دِيَارِهِمْ وَ اَمْوَالِهِمْ يَبْتَغُوْنَ فَضْلًا مِّنَ اللّٰهِ وَ رِضْوَانًا وَّ يَنْصُرُوْنَ اللّٰهَ وَ رَسُوْلَهٗ ط اُولٰٓئِكَ هُمُ الصّٰدِقُوْنَ

For the poor Muhājirīn who were expelled from their homes and their properties, seeking bounty from Allah and (His) approval and supporting Allah and His Rasūl, (there is also a share). These are those who are truthful.[1]

And:

وَ الَّذِيْنَ تَبَوَّؤُا الدَّارَ وَ الْاِيْمَانَ مِنْ قَبْلِهِمْ يُحِبُّوْنَ مَنْ هَاجَرَ اِلَيْهِمْ وَ لَا يَجِدُوْنَ فِيْ صُدُوْرِهِمْ حَاجَةً مِّمَّا اُوْتُوْا وَ يُؤْثِرُوْنَ عَلٰى اَنْفُسِهِمْ وَلَوْ كَانَ بِهِمْ خَصَاصَةٌ ط وَ مَنْ يُّوْقَ شُحَّ نَفْسِهٖ فَاُولٰٓئِكَ هُمُ الْمُفْلِحُوْنَ

And (also for) those who were settled in Madīnah (the Anṣār) and (adopted) the faith before them. They love those who emigrated to them and find not any want in their breasts for what they (the Muhājirīn) were given but give (them) preference over themselves, even though they are in privation. And whoever is protected from the stinginess of his soul — it is those who will be successful.[2]

---

1 Sūrah al-Ḥashr: 8.

2 Sūrah al-Ḥashr: 9.

And then:

وَ الَّذِيْنَ جَآءُوْ مِنْ بَعْدِهِمْ يَقُوْلُوْنَ رَبَّنَا اغْفِرْلَنَا وَ لِاِخْوَانِنَا الَّذِيْنَ سَبَقُوْنَا بِالْاِيْمَانِ وَ لَا تَجْعَلْ فِىْ قُلُوْبِنَا غِلًّا لِّلَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْا رَبَّنَا اِنَّكَ رَءُوْفٌ رَّحِيْمٌ

And (these is a share for) those who came after them, saying: "Our Rabb, forgive us and our brothers who preceded us in faith and put not in our hearts (any) resentment toward those who have believed. Our Rabb, indeed You are Kind and Merciful.[1]

These three subsequent verses are *badal* (alternatives) from near relatives and orphans and the [stranded] traveller.

It is evident that these characteristics have a relationship with the Fay' and that Fay' must be dispensed in these avenues. Since land and its revenue can continue forever, and it is not something that perishes upon usage such as food, which perishes upon consumption, therefore, the beneficiaries will continue benefitting from it till the end. If not, the implication of continuity and perpetuity, which is the effect of *Jumlah Ismiyyah* would be forfeited. This is only possible if Fay' is classified as Waqf and the actual land is not distributed among the recipients.

Since the predominant characteristic of the recipients has been mentioned, the Muḥaqqiqīn maintain that the khums which is received today, the share of the Prophet ﷺ would no longer be considered, as the characteristic of risālah is not to be found any longer.

Seventh evidence that the Prophet ﷺ did not have ownership of Fay'

It is obvious to one and all that Allah is the Supreme Owner of everything and everyone. The ownership of human beings is temporary and superficial. This is similar to a landlord owning a few homes which he has given on rent. Each tenant refers to the rented home as his home. Similarly, Allah has allowed us usage and benefit of the things given to us for some time and just like those tenants, we refer to those things as our personal belongings. Similarly, the landlord has to enter a contract with the lessee and receive rentals from him, otherwise the properties would remain in his possession. In the same way, our ownership of what has been created for our use is also dependent on a contract in order to secure it, which

1 Sūrah al-Ḥashr: 10.

could either be purchasing, receiving it as a gift or it being handed down to one as a bequest. If not, Allah retains ownership over it.

As for the Fay' lands, the only manner to secure ownership over it was through receiving it as booty, but this option has been ruled out because Allah had given it without any battle. Therefore, the Rasūl, Dhū al-Qurbā, etc., have been stipulated as beneficiaries to determine a means for them to secure their rights over it.

Nevertheless, these seven evidences highlight why these beneficiaries would be the perpetual recipients of the revenue from Fay' (and not its owners).

Therefore, Sayyidah Fāṭimah's رضي الله عنها claim for it establishes that she is not infallible. And even if she were infallible, infallible souls can have a misunderstanding sometimes as has been established. In this case, the reason for her misunderstanding is evident. She saw the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم administrating its affairs throughout his life and being the most devout woman, how would she know whether it was classified as Fay' or booty. Women of her calibre who have no worldly aspirations are bound to be in the dark about these material matters. More so, when the issue revolves around Fay' which is from the settlements of Khaybar.

It is evident that the nature of these settlements was diverse; some were conquered and others were secured peacefully, like Fadak. Consequently, there is a difference of opinion among the scholars about Khaybar; was it conquered or did they submit willingly.

Nevertheless, it is evident that the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم had no personal ownership over Fadak and that the remaining recipients are not determined in the manner in which zakāh is determined as a percentage upon one's wealth. This could have been entertained if not for the attachment of Dhū al-Qurbā upon Rasūl. Therefore, since the remaining beneficiaries had no ownership, ownership cannot be concluded for the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم too.

Two difficulties in considering Dhū al-Qurbā and other recipients the owners of Fay'

Assuming that Dhū al-Qurbā and other beneficiaries are owners of Fay' then it implies that the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم and these beneficiaries had joint ownership over Fay'. This creates two problems; firstly, this gives unlimited people joint ownership as there is no limitation of the Dhū al-Qurbā and other beneficiaries.

Their numbers could fluctuate on a daily basis. More so if we consider, "*And (these is a share for) those who came after them, saying: "Our Rabb, forgive us and our brothers who preceded us in faith,*" which includes all believers till the end of time. Secondly, booty and debts also for that matter cannot come into one's ownership unless it comes into one's possession. As for Fay' it has not come by through the efforts of the beneficiaries; it is God-given. Without assuming possession and authority over it, it remains unattached.

We can conclude that there is ample evidence suggesting that Fay' was not owned by the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. Just as how ownership is not established, the possibility of ownership is also not established. Conversely, the impossibility of ownership is manifest. This required such a lengthy deliberation from me, because though non-ownership is evident; I had to establish that the possibility of ownership is also not fathomable. Since I am debating with obtuse people, I was compelled to elaborate at length.

An objection about Waqf which stems from the verse, "And those your right hand possesses"

It should be noted that *what Allah restored* is general, which includes movable and immovable property. Therefore, if *what Allah restored* attains the classification of Waqf, then it includes movables, and this creates two problems. Firstly, the Ḥanafī school of thought maintain that movables cannot be classified as Waqf. Secondly, movables from the Fay' were never classified as Waqf and it was always considered personal property according to the unanimous view of scholars. Consequently, these movables were bought, sold and owned, indicating that these movables of Fay' were not Waqf. This is evident from the fact that the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ distributed the arms and weapons from the Fay' of Banū Naḍīr among the Ṣaḥābah, with no hint of it being Waqf property in any way.

In fact, there is clear testimony of this in the Qur'ān which is supreme evidence. Consider the following verse:

وَمَا مَلَكَتْ يَمِيْنُكَ مِمَّا اَفَآءَ اللّٰهُ عَلَيْكَ

And those your right hand possesses from what Allah has returned to you (of captives).[1]

1 Sūrah al-Aḥzāb: 50.

This means: O Nabī, we have made lawful for you those bondswomen whom you have received through the Fay' which Allah has handed over to you.

Consequently, it is evident from this verse that the slaves (movables) from Fay' are not classified as Waqf, they can be owned. Therefore, if one item of the Waqf can be owned it creates an objection about the interpretation that we have given to *what Allah restored* and the beneficiaries listed there.

It must, therefore, be determined what the true nature of the Fay' is; if it is Waqf, then all of it must be classified as Waqf and if it is not Waqf then movables and non-movables must be given the same classification.

Response to this objection

Firstly, we do accept that Imām Abū Ḥanīfah does not consider the Waqf of movables to be valid. However, Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ is not subjected to taqlīd of the view of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah. The worst-case scenario is that Imām Abū Ḥanīfah has erred, and the Ahl al-Sunnah have never claimed that their Imām is infallible. Instead, they maintain that a Mujtahid errs and he deduces correctly, but his correct rulings overwhelm his errors. Therefore, it is possible that he has erred and why not? Ṣāḥibayn—his two students[1]—maintain that Waqf of movables is valid. Ṣāḥibayn are also Imāms of the Ahl al-Sunnah, and if the Shīʿah would have followed them instead of people like al-Ṭūsī, al-Raḍī, Sharīf al-Murtaḍā and Abū al-Qāsim then it would have been their good fortune.

However, what if the Qur'ānic verse supports Imām Abū Ḥanīfah's view after all? Let us elaborate on this but please do not be biased and listen carefully if you really wish to know how it justifies Imām Abū Ḥanīfah's view. Consequently, the verses preceding this which commence from:

هُوَ الَّذِىْٓ اَخْرَجَ الَّذِيْنَ كَفَرُوْا مِنْ اَهْلِ الْكِتٰبِ مِنْ دِيَارِهِمْ لِاَوَّلِ الْحَشْرِ

It is He who expelled the ones who disbelieved among the People of the Scripture from their homes at the first gathering.

Till:

1 Imām Muḥammad and Imām Abū Yūsuf.

مَا قَطَعْتُمْ مِّنْ لِّيْنَةٍ اَوْ تَرَكْتُمُوْهَا قَآئِمَةً عَلٰى اُصُوْلِهَا فَبِاِذْنِ اللّٰهِ وَ لِيُخْزِىَ الْفٰسِقِيْنَ

Whatever you have cut down of (their) palm trees or left standing on their trunks, it was by permission of Allah and so He would disgrace the defiantly disobedient.[1]

establishes that *what Allah restored* refers to homes and vacant lands. Therefore, only immovables are implied by *what Allah restored*, not movables. Now despite the word *Mā* (what) having a general all-encompassing connotation, it has been qualified by the passage preceding it and this occurs very commonly in Arabic usage (i.e. the confinement of *Mā* to specific things). Children studying the primary text of *al-Kāfiyah* understand that in the sentence:

الاسم ما دل على معنى

Mā refers to a word.

This is why Mawlānā Jāmī explains that *Mā* refers to a word in *Sharḥ Mullā*.

This establishes that *what Allah restored* refers to immovables only, not both movables and immovable. Subsequently the phrase, "so that it will not be a perpetual distribution among the rich from among you," also supports this because perpetual distribution is only possible in something that remains intact and this cannot be the case with movables as it is subject to wear and tear and perishing through consumption. Whilst some movables may have some lifespan, the possibility of perpetual distribution cannot be visualised as the verse, "And those who came after them, saying: 'Our Rabb, forgive us and our brothers who preceded us in faith,'" extends the beneficiaries till the end of time. In this case, surely only immovables like land can survive that duration of time and only it can be subjected to perpetual distribution.

Therefore, *what Allah restored* does not include movables and there is no objection against Imām Abū Ḥanīfah رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّٰهُ.

An unanswered question

If *what Allah restored* does not include the movables acquired through Fay' then what would its classification be. Would it be classified as Waqf, like Fay', or would it

1 Sūrah al-Ḥashr: 2-5.

be possible to have ownership like that which is acquired as booty? In my humble opinion it would be possible and the recipient would have ownership. If anyone can prove otherwise, then I would be more than happy to accept their view.

Allow me to substantiate my view; Waqf is usually something where the actual item remains and it is then utilised (without the actual thing perishing). Therefore, the actual item remains and its benefits are dispensed or utilised by beneficiaries.

Movables Such as Food and Crops Cannot Be Classified as Waqf

Since the Waqf item and its benefits are two separate entities the word *for Allah* along with the other recipients listed in Fay' is valid because the actual thing remains in the ownership of Allah, whilst the beneficiaries enjoy its revenue. As for benefits of Waqf, it is something that does not have long-lasting endurance.

Consider edible items—which are movable—and which are one of the benefits derived from Waqf land. Benefits in our discussion here refer to that which is not worthy of utilising again once it has been benefited from; instead it is consumable and perishable. Therefore, food perishes once consumed.

Besides food which is perishable, other movable items—received as Fay'—could include clothing, conveyances etc. Clothing and perishables from one perspective can be considered like immovables because in the case of conveyances, the animal is one entity and the benefits derived from it such as riding it and making a journey easy are a separate matter. Similarly, a garment is one entity and the benefit of wearing it to protect oneself from cold or heat is a separate matter.

But if this perspective is considered than almost every other item of human use could be defined in the same way. Therefore, bread is an entity and its ability to nourish and sustain is a separate issue. However, this perspective does not entitle it to being classified as Waqf. Had this been so, then just as how land is made Waqf, the harvest of it would also have been made Waqf, but this is not valid according to anyone. Waqf demands that the actual item be retained and that it be imperishable whilst its benefits are distributed to beneficiaries. In the case of food, the actual item perishes. Therefore, if grains and crops were classified as Waqf, then just as the Fay' lands were Waqf, these would also have been Waqf and it would not have been possible for the recipients to sell it or give it as hibah, or that it be inherited from them or bequeathed (which are the rules of Waqf) but none prohibits them from this.

Therefore, crops are classified purely as benefits. The benefits of Waqf — when given to the recipients is classified as charity and they then become its owners. They are then permitted to sell it or do as they like. So, if someone wishes to consider crops and harvest as a Waqf item, then let them do so. In this instance the discussion revolves around the crops of the lands of Fay' which is the Waqf of Allah Taʿālā and these crops unanimously cannot be Waqf otherwise the recipients would not receive it.

Conveyances and clothing cannot be considered Waqf items

As for clothing and conveyances, if anyone does make any distinction between this and crops then it would only be that crops perish upon consumption whilst clothing and conveyances do not perish [instantly] upon usage. But if we reflect closely, this is just like the case of a loaf of bread; if one slice is eaten the remaining is still available. Similarly, benefitting from clothing and conveyances brings gradual decay despite these not perishing instantly. That is why it is seen that those animals which are used for riding and carrying burdens are noticeably weaker and leaner than animals that are left free. Clothing also wears out gradually with each cycle of wash and wear.

Nevertheless, items of benefit perish instantly or gradually, whereas that which exists absolutely, such as land, it is not perishable. This is evidently the reason why Imām Abū Ḥanīfah considered the Waqf of movables invalid. Ṣāḥibayn and those who maintain that view have considered these movables as Waqf, on account of the temporary existence of the item—which differs from item to item—but the above explanation accords merit to the view of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah.

Deliberation of Ṣāḥibayn's stance regarding Waqf of movables

If we disregard the above discussion, then the stance of Ṣāḥibayn seems to be correct since, firstly, the benefits derived from clothes, conveyances, and other necessary items of life are—according to our idiomatic usage—assigned to the items themselves. Further, as long as they remain in their forms of utility, they are not assigned to their substance. which gradually decays with use.

Secondly, just as every human is considered a separate entity in relation to rest of humanity, the different benefits derived from clothing and conveyances are considered separate entities in their own right. Thus, if some of the entities—

humans or benefits—cease to exist it does not translate into the entire species becoming non-existent. Therefore, if at some point, some benefits are lost, it does not mean the principle benefit is lost. And since the existence of its various benefits relies on only the existence of the principle item, why would Waqf of the said items not be possible?

This is unlike the benefit gained through food items since such benefit eats into itself. For example, the benefit gained from half a slice of bread is half of what could be attained from one slice.

The stance of Ṣāḥibayn helps our cause too

If the stance of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah is taken, then it is quite obvious that movable property cannot be classified as Waqf from fay' nor can it be classified as Waqf. Though, if the stance of Ṣāḥibayn is taken then too our cause does not fail. To grasp this, consider the principle in the greatest necessity of human life; food. Every other movable wealth is secondary to it. All secondary items are in fact a means to attain this principle wealth of food. Now, Waqf is a mechanism instituted to alleviate need, and the only true need is that of food. Thus, there has to be a necessity of food for those on the receiving end of Waqf from fay', albeit not from other types of Waqf.

It is therefore understood that the objective of the Waqf from fay' is alleviating need through food. This is further cemented by the indications of the Qur'ān wherein Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ used words such as *Rasūl*, *Masākīn*, *Fuqarā'*, and *Ibn Sabīl*. The second and third demographic has the innate distinguishing mark of poverty, i.e. lack of food. The other words describe personas of the same standing. In the word 'Rasūl' this meaning is found in the sense that the Messenger is sent with a particular task in which he expands all his energies due to which he has no time to spend in attaining a livelihood. The livelihood of the Messenger is thus the responsibility of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ. As far as orphans and travellers are concerned, due to them being detached from sources of income, here too the meaning of poverty is found. Consequently, in all the categories poverty is found to some degree.

Waqf of movable items is of no benefit to the poor

If they are given movable items than they can either benefit from it by using it to earn a living, for example, by using a conveyance as a means of transportation hire

or by selling the item received. However, selling items of Waqf is not permissible and as such instead of the items alleviating their need, it can become a burden for them to bear. Further both options don't guarantee an immediate return for their immediate need. Taking these issues into consideration, Waqf of movable items is of no use to the poor. This viewpoint serves to strengthens the viewpoint of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah.

Some immovable items give long term recurring benefit

Immovable items such as houses and lands similarly may not provide immediate solutions to the immediate need of the poor. However, there remains a distinct difference between this and movable items based on which the latter cannot be inferred from the former.

Firstly, benefits attained from movable items are not perpetual as opposed to land and property which can be always utilized to farm crops. Additionally, if nothing is grown and reaped from the land at present, it does not affect the land being instituted as Waqf. It will remain within this designation even if not utilized in the manner it was endowed for. This is similar to a masjid which lays abandoned. Even though no ṣalāh takes place there at this moment it still remains within its designation of endowment as long as the possibility of it being utilized for it remains.

Secondly, though the need for food is a principle need, this does not negate the principle need for housing which is as important. Waqf of a land provides the stability of food, land, and housing, issues that are severely lacking from the Waqf of movable items.

A linguistic discussion on "Those your right hand possesses"

It has become quite evident that the verse, "*those your right hand possesses from what Allah has returned to you,*" is not against our standpoint at all. Rather, it accords merit to our view as the particle *min* (from) in *mimā* (from what) shows *Tabʿīḍ* (partitivity).

Accordingly, two issues come to the fore. Firstly, the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ was not privy to ownership of the **entire** fay' and secondly, the portion of which 'ownership' was afforded to him was as an administrator not as a titleholder. If not, he would have

had singular ownership of the entire fay’ since the reason of its incorporation was singular.

The word *Yamīnuka* (your right hand) carries a similar connotation. If ownership of the entire fay’ before distribution was intended, there was no need to specify *Yamīnuka* (your right hand). The pronoun in *Malakta* (you own) would have sufficed.

The nature of the Prophet’s صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ portion from the fay’

It is clear that the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ was not the owner before possession; however, the question of having a right in it—like that of a creditor in borrowed wealth and the warrior in booty—remains. Did the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ have such right in the wealth of fay’? Or was the relationship with the fay’ similar to the relationship of the poor in relation to the wealth of the rich in which they enjoy no such right whereby they can lay any claim? The Prophet’s صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ relation with the wealth of fay’ was like of the latter group, he was simply a beneficiary, worthy of receiving a share from it.

There are two types of claims. *Istiḥqāq Qawī* (strong claims) which are also known as *Istiḥqāq Fiʿlī*, *Istiḥqāq Shakṣī*, or *Istiḥqāq Ḥaqīqī*. And *Istiḥqāq Ḍaʿīf* (weak claims) which are also known as *Istiḥqāq Infiʿālī*, *Istiḥqāq Nawʿī*, or *Istiḥqāq Majāzī*.

In *Istiḥqāq Qawī* (strong claims) the claimant has a tangible existent claim (*Amr Wujūdī*) which serves as the basis for his claim. In the issue of debts, this is self-evident. Even in booty it is quite clear since jihād is a positively existent concept, which is probably the reason why attaining booty has been attributed to the slave instead of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ—though all in reality is from Allah—in the following verse by use of the applicable pronoun:

وَاعْلَمُوْا أَنَّمَا غَنِمْتُم مِّنْ شَيْءٍ

*And know that anything **you** obtain of war booty…*[1]

On the other hand, in *Istiḥqāq Ḍaʿīf* (weak claims) there is poverty or insolvency, both concepts that are positively non-existent (*Amr ʿAdmī*) which cannot serve as a tangible prospect to lay claim to. That is why a rich person will not be considered

1 Sūrah al-Tawbah: 41.

an oppressor by the merely not giving wealth to an insolvent person. Yes, if he doesn't fulfil his religious obligations, he will be sinful, as he has not fulfilled the right of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى; however, the insolvent person cannot demand anything from him. This point is further driven by the fact that when discharging the religious obligation of zakāt, one is not obliged to give to every category mentioned in the verse outlining the various categories of recipients.

The categories of recipients are formulated on the basis of poverty

If, for arguments sake, we say that due to insolvency one is obligated to give, then to give all insolvent people would have been necessary. However, since this is not the case, is it also not necessary to give to every category. Poverty in most of the categories is self-evident, though in the *Mu'allafat al-Qulūb*[1] and the *ʿĀmilīn*[2] it is not.

The answer to this is that in the case of the latter, *Mu'allafat al-Qulūb*, they distribute it amongst the poor and as such it is just like giving to the poor. In the former giving them would result in a general increase of alms and in relation to them this was a kind of transaction. In the early days the Muslims were few and some of those who had accepted Islam did not have firm faith. A share was allocated to them which the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ would give to them; this resulted in the entrenchment of their faith. When a person receives from another, the love of the one giving is embedded into the heart of the one that receives. Through this method of giving the *Mu'allafat al-Qulūb* the love of the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ was embedded into their hearts which is the essence of faith. Since after the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ the number of Muslims increased manifold, this category became obsolete.

To summarize, in *Istiḥqāq Ḍaʿīf* (weak claims) the recipients right is positively non-existent (*Amr ʿAdmī*), due to which they cannot lay a claim. Yes, the command of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى is an *Amr Wujūdī* (existent right) which brings forth an obligation, therefore Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى can take one to task for non-fulfilment. The above demonstrates that poverty and insolvency merely allows for being on the receiving end which is equal amongst all the categories, thus anyone from the categories given will do.

---

1 Those who have just recently embraced Islam and are still weak in faith; they may be given Zakāh so as bring their hearts closer to Islam.

2 Those appointed to collect the Zakāh, they are also considered as valid recipients on account of the effort they make in collecting.

Understanding this, it becomes clear that the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ did not have a right that rested on an Amr Wujūdī in relation to the wealth of fay'. There was no debt owed to him by the disbelievers nor did they make any bequests for him. There was a possibility of it being *ghanīmah*; however, Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ rejected this notion with the following verse:

وَمَا أَفَاءَ اللّٰهُ عَلَىٰ رَسُوْلِهِ مِنْهُمْ فَمَا أَوْجَفْتُمْ عَلَيْهِ مِنْ خَيْلٍ وَلَا رِكَابٍ
وَلٰكِنَّ اللّٰهَ يُسَلِّطُ رُسُلَهُ عَلَىٰ مَنْ يَشَاءُ وَاللّٰهُ عَلَىٰ كُلِّ شَيْءٍ قَدِيْرٌ

And what Allah restored [of property] to His Messenger from them, you did not spur for it [in an expedition] any horses or camels, but Allah gives His Messengers power over whom He wills, and Allah is over all things competent.[1]

The right that the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ had in relation to the fay' was then no doubt *Istiḥqāq Ḍaʿīf* (weak claim) which is also the reason Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ attributed its procurement to Himself and not to the servants by the wording *and what Allah restored*.

Based on this the majority view of the scholars is that after the passing of the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ his right to the fay' had fallen away. The Shīʿah, who opine that his right had been inherited by the Imāms have based their opinion on conjecture with no proof signifying the same.

A linguistic discussion on from what Allah has returned to you

If the word *Afā'* (restored) in the verse is taken in its technical meaning to mean fay' then there are two possibilities. Either the preposition *min* (from) in *mimā* (from that) implies *Tabʿīḍ* (partitivity) or it implies *Tabyīn* (clarification). If we take it to imply partitivity, it is evidently in our favour as already discussed. On the other hand, if we take it to imply clarification—which is far-fetched considering the context—then too it would not be against our understanding.

This discussion emerges only when considering its technical meaning. If, however, we consider its literal meaning then it would merely imply the returning or restoring by Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ of His property from the disbelievers to the administration of the

1 Sūrah al-Ḥashr: 6.

Prophet ﷺ. In such a case, there is no reason to consider the 'ownership' of the Prophet ﷺ as returning or restoring of wealth in its literal meaning. This is the same in fay' and ghanīmah.

Determining the meaning of fay'

The use of *Afā'* (restored) in the Qur'ān is in two places; in Sūrah al-Ḥashr and in Sūrah al-Aḥzāb. Sūrah al-Aḥzāb was revealed before Sūrah al-Ḥashr as is explicitly mentioned in *al-Itqān* under the discussion of the order of chapter revelation. The technical meaning of fay' implies the procurement of property with no fight or battle as understood from you did not spur for it. If this was already included in the implication of *Afā'* (restored) then there was no need for stating *you did not spur for it*, and since the word came into vogue the whole concept was shortened to just the word fay'. The point being, that since the verse in Sūrah al-Ḥashr, which is the origin of the technical term, is meant in its literal meaning, the verse that was revealed before it in Sūrah al-Aḥzāb would also be in its literal meaning.

By the grace of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ the issues pertaining to the verse, *And what Allah restored [of property] to His Messenger*, has been explained in detail. As a result, any person of high or low intellect will understand that Fadak was not the property of the Prophet ﷺ and it could not have been given as a gift nor could it have been inherited. Another detail that has become glaringly obvious is that the narrations of the Shīʿah regarding the Fadak Estate are nothing more than lies and fabrications. It is impossible to conceive that the Prophet ﷺ would gift someone from property that did not belong to him.

Continued misunderstanding of the Qur'ān by the Prophet ﷺ is an impossibility

The idea that the Prophet ﷺ misunderstood the laws of the Qur'ān is absurd. If the Prophet ﷺ did not have deep insight into the Qur'ān, then who would? How can it be that simpletons like us understand the inferences of the Qur'ān and the Prophet ﷺ doesn't? Sure, if the Shīʿah want to believe such then so be it. Yes, if it was a lay person of the Ummah one could say he had made a mistake in understanding the verses, but it is impossible that the Prophet ﷺ would make a mistake and then not be counselled by Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ.

If—for arguments sake—we assume that the Prophet ﷺ was under the impression that the Fadak estate was not part of the fay', rather his property and so he mistakenly gifted it then it would have been necessary for revelation to come down, correct this misstep, and return the Fadak Estate.

The verse, And what Allah restored [of property] to His Messenger, is a Mukhaṣṣiṣ of the verse, Yūsīkum Allāh (Allah instructs you all)

Though for the Shīʿah they don't even have to go through the trouble of hypothetical scenarios as they believe in the doctrine of Badā', i.e. that Allah can make a mistake [Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى save us from such folly].

In any case, there is no way that gifting of the Fadak Estate was possible, ergo Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا owning it is also an impossibility. In order to gift something, one must first own the item. Based on this, it is clear that inheriting the Fadak Estate was also not possible.

Another issue that comes to the fore is that *if* the verse *Yūsīkum Allāh* (Allah instructs you all) applies to the Prophet ﷺ and to others equally then too no finger can be pointed to Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ as the verse *And what Allah restored* qualifies it and expounds on the wealth of fay'—in which the Fadak Estate is also included—as well as the position of the Prophet ﷺ in relation to it.

The Fadak Estate is not included in Yūsīkum Allāh (Allah instructs you all)

After an analysis of the verses it becomes clear that there is no need to qualify one with the other. When qualifying one verse with another the implication is that the laws derived from them are similar; however, this is not the case here. *If Yūsīkum Allāh* (Allah instructs you all) applies to and includes the inheritance of the Prophet ﷺ as well, then it would apply to that inheritance which he was the owner of as the laws of inheritance applies to that which one has ownership of. Since, the Fadak Estate was an endowment it did not fall under the ambit of ownership. Therefore, it does not fall under the laws of the verse under discussion. Further, if this verse was not present then we would have to look for a qualifier (*Mukhaṣṣiṣ*) which is found in the narration:

ما تركنا صدقة

What we leave behind is charity.

However, it is clear that we are not in need of a qualifier since it was not under ownership that it be governed by the laws of inheritance.

Additionally, there are other examples where this verse has been qualified. For instance, a disbeliever will not inherit, a slave will not inherit, and a murderer will not inherit. These exclusions are not by other verses of the Qur'ān, rather it is by the aḥādīth. Since this is the case then what is the matter with accepting the narration, *what we leave behind is charity*, as a qualifier? Thus, even if the verse, *And what Allah restored*, is not considered, this narration will serve as a qualifier. Such qualifying does not signal a contradiction, though if such qualifying is termed as a contradiction by some then such 'contradiction' is accepted by both the Sunnī and the Shīʿah.

True contradiction of the sources by the Shīʿah

Not giving inheritance to the grandchildren of the deceased in the presence of the parents—as the Shīʿah opine—is contradictory in the true sense. The grandchildren form part of the children without a shadow of doubt. And since Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى instructs inheritance in favour of the children, the grandchildren are also included therein. If the Shīʿah require evidence for the grandchildren being part of the children, then they should consider the verse of *Mubāhalah* which by consensus of both the Sunnī and the Shīʿah refers to Ḥasan, Ḥusayn and others رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ. Here is the verse in reference:

فَمَنْ حَاجَّكَ فِيْهِ مِن بَعْدِ مَا جَاءَكَ مِنَ الْعِلْمِ فَقُلْ تَعَالَوْا نَدْعُ أَبْنَاءَنَا وَأَبْنَاءَكُمْ وَنِسَاءَنَا وَنِسَاءَكُمْ وَأَنْفُسَنَا وَأَنْفُسَكُمْ ثُمَّ نَبْتَهِلْ فَنَجْعَل لَّعْنَتَ اللّٰهِ عَلَى الْكَاذِبِيْنَ

Then whoever argues with you about it after [this] knowledge has come to you, say, "Come, let us call our sons and your sons, our women and your women, ourselves and yourselves, then supplicate earnestly [together] and invoke the curse of Allah upon the liars [among us]."[1]

More evidence of this is the many instances of the Qur'ān proclaiming:

1 Sūrah Āl ʿImrān: 61.

O Children of Israel.

By which the children of Yaʿqūb are meant. It is clear that none of the children of Yaʿqūb عليه السلام were present during its revelation to the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم, rather it was his far descendants but here to the word *children* is used.

Another contradiction of theirs is that they opine that the wife will not receive inheritance from the land or from the value of the land. Similarly, maternal brothers and sisters will not receive inheritance from blood money. Further, a murderer will receive inheritance from the inheritance and blood money of the murdered in the case of an accidental killing.

All this is in stark contrast to the dictates of the Qur'ān. The Qur'ān speaks with generality regarding the inheritance of the wife, brothers, and sisters with no exception of inheritance from lands. Similarly, the narration states, "The murderer will not inherit". The purport of the narration is general without exception, be it pre-meditated or accidental.

More contradictions are found in the form of the eldest son receiving the muṣḥaf, ring, and other items of the deceased. Regarding this practice, the Shīʿah present narrations that outline the actions of their Imāms in as far as them not including it in the inheritance. Firstly, these narrations are narrated by only Shīʿah reporters and secondly it totally contradicts the Qur'ānic injunctions. If they present the excuse of the infallibility of their Imāms, well, we only accept infallibility of the Prophets.

Explicit direction is worthy of following, whilst actions have the possibility of a distinct standalone law

Instruction by way of spoken word is prioritised over following the actions of even an infallible since there is a possibility that the act is unique to the infallible. Consider the tens of laws that are unique to the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم, for example, he was not restricted to four marriages and he was permitted to fast continuously whereas others were not allowed either. In an instruction by way of spoken word there is no such ambiguity.

Since the Shīʿah opine the actions of their 'infallible' Imāms are to be followed then what of the direct speech of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم? Should priority not be

given to that? The narration which states, "Our property will not be inherited, what we leave is ṣadaqah" is worthier of following based on the above discussion alone. Over and above that, the status of the Imāms is nowhere close to that of the Prophet ﷺ.

Another point of note is that the narration, "We (the Ambiyā') are not inherited from," is an explanation of the verses of the Qur'ān that deal with inheritance. Sure, it can be understood to be a qualifier; however, recognizing it as an explanation makes even more sense. On the other hand, the Shīʿah narration neither serves as a qualifier nor as an explanation. It is a complete contradiction. It also holds no weight in comparison to the narration of Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه. Even so, they consider their narration worthy of being a qualifier, then what is the issue with considering the ḥadīth of Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه as such due to which he did not hand over the Fadak Estate? He heard this narration directly from the Prophet ﷺ, and did not pass judgment based on a foreign legal system!

If we disregard both the ḥadīth of Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه and the Shīʿah narration and only look at the verse *Yūsīkum Allāh* (Allah instructs you all) in the light of ʿ*aql* (logic) and *naql* (reports) it becomes abundantly clear which side would be weightier.

In any case, holding the Shīʿah accountable to every view of theirs is tiring. I am weary of constantly embarrassing them and I feel disinclined to keep refuting their falsities. If one reads these pages with impartiality, he will no doubt realise that there would be many other such absurdities of the Shīʿah.

Nevertheless, since certainty results in ease, the remainder of Molvī ʿAmmār ʿAlī's letter will also be considered and answered so that there remains no doubt of the reasons of its ludicrousness. Though my tasks at hand are many and I do not have much time, I find myself continuing with this effort. Thus, objections to the narration:

ما تركنا صدقة

What we leave behind is charity.

and to the verse:

> *So, give me from Yourself an heir, who will inherit me and inherit from the family of Yaʿqūb.*[1]

and the verse:

وَوَرِثَ سُلَيْمَانُ دَاوُوْدَ

And Sulaymān inherited Dāwūd.[2]

Will be answered appropriately.

Another point to consider is that since we now know that the verse *Yūsīkum Allāh* (Allah instructs you all) applies only to the Ummah and not to the Prophet ﷺ the ḥadīth in reference is not even needed. There is no question of inheritance in the wealth of the Prophet ﷺ since he is not included in the ambit of this statute. To drive the point further the verse, *And what Allah restored*, establishes that the Fadak Estate was not even under his ownership. Thus, in reality there remains no argument. Now, even if someone establishes that the laws of inheritance apply to the Prophet ﷺ then too it would not apply to the Fadak Estate. For inheritance to occur there must be prior ownership.

Even if the narration, "We (the Ambiyā') are not inherited from," is not acceptable, it has no bearing on the Fadak Estate

If by the apparent contradiction of the narration and the verse, the narration is not acceptable then too it has no bearing on the Fadak Estate. Because firstly, the Prophet ﷺ is already excluded from the purport of verse *Yūsīkum Allāh* (Allah instructs you all) by way of indication. If we assume that there was inheritance in the wealth of the other Prophets then so be it, our discussion revolves around the inheritance of the Prophet ﷺ. By token of the non-acceptance of the narration the Fadak Estate still cannot be considered for inheritance. Yes, if the verse *Yūsīkum Allāh* (Allah instructs you all) is rejected then a case may be built.

Secondly, even if the estate of the Prophet ﷺ were to be tied up according to the common law of inheritance, then too the issue at hand, the Fadak Estate, will not be included therein due to the purport of the verse *And what Allah restored*. If

---

1 Sūrah Maryam: 5, 6.

2 Sūrah al-Naml: 16.

the Shīʿah then want to reject this verse too and drag themselves out of the fold of Islam, then let them do so.

Nonetheless, the ruling issued by Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه in not handing over the Fadak Estate was in complete conformity to the Prophetic teachings. We have no need to establish conformity between the aforementioned verses and narrations nor do we need to answer any apparent contradiction.

This entire issue is resolved by the tone of address in the verse *Yūsīkum Allāh* (Allah instructs you all) and the indication in the verse *And what Allah restored*.

Determining the Nature of the Inheritance of the Ambiyā’

In order to establish the veracity and credibility of Ṣiddīq al-Akbar رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ it is essential to elaborate on this matter too. However, I will firstly deliberate on the issue of contradiction between the ḥadīth regarding the possessions of the Ambiyā’ not being subjected to inheritance and the apparent conflict with the verse:

فَهَبْ لِيْ مِنْ لَدُنْكَ وَلِيًّا يَرِثُنِيْ وَيَرِثُ مِنْ آلِ يَعْقُوْبَ

So, give me from Yourself an heir, who will inherit me and inherit from the family of Yaʿqūb.[1]

Firstly, does the term *Yarithu* (inherit from) refer to wealth, on account of which this verse is said to oppose the ḥadīth transmitted by Ṣiddīq al-Akbar رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ. Secondly, *Min Āl Yaʿqūb* (from the family of Yaʿqūb) could refer to its actual meaning or a metaphoric meaning. If it is in the metaphorical context, then *Āl Yaʿqūb* (family of Yaʿqūb) refers to Yaʿqūb عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ himself; and this is common in Arabic dialogue where *Āl* of so and so actually refers to that particular person. Or is *Āl Yaʿqūb* (family of Yaʿqūb) actually referring to the apparent meaning (i.e. the family of Yaʿqūb عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ).

Therefore, if the metaphorical context is implied then it would mean that the estate of Nabī Yaʿqūb عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ was not distributed for a period of over 2000 years and that Nabī Zakariyyā عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ knew that it would be distributed before his demise. But if this wealth was going to be distributed after his prayer and before his demise then there was no need to add the words *Min Āl Yaʿqūb* (from the family of Yaʿqūb); instead *Yarithunī* (inherit me) was adequate since Nabī Yaḥyā عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ would inherit directly from Nabī Zakariyyā عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ. Therefore, this part of the verse would be meaningless.

Nevertheless, this implies that Nabī Yaʿqūb عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ left this world over 2000 years ago and his Estate remained undistributed despite having so many relatives and heirs in this lengthy period. This surely does not make sense, unless of course it appeals to foolish minds.

If the literal meaning of *Āl Yaʿqūb* (family of Yaʿqūb) is meant, then it implies that Nabī Zakariyyā عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ was the sole inheritor of the entire wealth of each and every

1 Sūrah Maryam: 5, 6.

individual of the Banī Isrā'īl despite them numbering hundreds of thousands of individuals. It also implies that he enjoyed such familial ties with each one of them on account of which he would be the inheritor of his estate. Thirdly, it implies that every individual of the Banī Isrā'īl should expire before Nabī Zakariyyā عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ and leave no dependants so that Nabī Zakariyyā عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ could inherit everything as suggested by *Min Āl Yaʿqūb* (from the family of Yaʿqūb). Therefore, this implication is more absurd and preposterous that the first one.

Therefore, both implications are impossible and they do not make sense at all. Why would Nabī Zakariyyā عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ—being a Nabī of Allah—make such a statement and why would Allah record such meaningless words in the Qur'ān, which is unparalleled in eloquence?

It is possible that someone may challenge what we have said above by saying that *Min Āl Yaʿqūb* (from the family of Yaʿqūb) does not necessarily refer to every individual of the progeny of Nabī Yaʿqūb عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ. However, if the text was: *Min* ***Kulli Wāḥid min*** *Āl Yaʿqūb* (**from every one of them** of the family of Yaʿqūb) it would have referred to each and every individual of this progeny and then this could have been a valid objection. But the intelligent understand that if *Min Āl Yaʿqūb* (from the family of Yaʿqūb) only referred to one or two individuals then what was the need to even mention this when *Yarithunī* (inherit me) was adequate? In addition to this *Āl* in Arabic dialogue refers to the entire group without exclusion of any individual.

Therefore, the Shīʿah deduction of inheritance from the Ambiyā' taken from this verse and subsequent criticism of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ for transmitting the ḥadīth which is in conflict with this, is like the case of someone whose nose has been cut off, and he mocks at those who have noses. When the scholars of this group are steeped in such ignorance then what would be the condition of the laity.

Similarly, Nabī Zakariyyā عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ mentions two words in his prayer; *Walī* (heir) and *Yarithunī* (inherit me). If *Walī* refers to a son, then *Yarithunī* (inherit me) is redundant because the son inevitably will be the inheritor. But if they say that he added *Yarithunī* (inherit me) to avoid his son doing one of two actions which would make him forfeit his father's inheritance, such as reverting from Islam or taking his father's life, then there is still no need for adding *Yarithunī* (inherit me) because the words, *And make him, My Rabb, pleasing (to You)*, comes further on, and takes care of this apprehension.

As for saying that he added *Yarithunī* (inherit me) so that the child would not die before him, then this is a possibility that could only be entertained by those who have no knowledge of Allah. The fact that he sought a successor on account of him fearing the successors after him, implies that the son should succeed him. Similarly, the term *Walī* itself refers to a successor and inevitably he must live on after the demise of Nabī Zakariyyā عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ.

Putting all these absurdities aside for a moment, there is enough evidence to prove that the inheritance of Nabī Zakariyyā عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ was not material possessions because if it was material possessions then it tarnishes his image as a Nabī of Allah. Was he so covetous of wealth that he went to such lengths to preserve it for his son even though he could not get possession of it in his own lifetime? Did love for wealth actually make him ask for a son who could enjoy it? Such characteristics are associated with lovers of this world, not the Ambiyā' of Allah.

The Shīʿah are not content on criticising Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهُ; they have surpassed that to the level whereby the Ambiyā' are not even spared. Who can comprehend the level of the Ambiyā', before whom the world and its contents are not more than camel or goat droppings? Furthermore, Nabī Zakariyyā عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ—with his unique position of austerity—would he go to these limits to secure a trivial portion of this worldly possessions? And would he put this matter before Allah, listing all the reasons why his supplications desperately need to be responded to?

Similarly, he adds:

وَإِنِّي خِفْتُ الْمَوَالِيَ مِن وَرَائِي

And indeed, I fear the successors after me.[1]

To enhance the urgency of his supplication so that there is no delay in response. Subḥān Allāh! This surely cannot be a Nabī, it must be the aspirations of worldly people. In fact, those who are steeped in love of this world also do not have such far-fetched ambitions. If Nabī Zakariyyā عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ apprehended that his relatives would squander his wealth after his demise and this prompted him to say, "I fear the successors after me," then this does not make sense because he is not responsible or answerable for their actions after he has left this world. If he really had this

1 Sūrah Maryam: 5.

fear, he could have spent all his wealth for the sake of Allah, so that it would not be owned by corrupt relatives and he would accrue rewards for that. If his son was righteous and he spent it in the cause of Allah, then these rewards would be for his son, not him.

However, the thought of still living on and being dependant on his wealth could have deterred him from spending it all for the sake of Allah. So, if lack of patience and failing to adopt *tawakkul* (reliance on Allah) despite being a Nabī deterred him from giving his wealth away in noble causes, then it is a fact that Ambiyā' do not leave this world without consenting to return to Allah. Therefore, he could have given it away when the notice of death came along and this would have protected it from corrupt relatives.

The conclusion to this entire discussion is that "inherit" in this verse cannot by any means refer to wealth and material possessions.

The inheritance of Nabī Dāwūd عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام

وَوَرِثَ سُلَيْمَانُ دَاوُودَ

And Sulaymān inherited Dāwūd.[1]

In a similar manner, logic demands that the inheritance of Nabī Dāwūd عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام, which was received by Nabī Sulaymān عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام cannot be material possessions. However, if the Shīʿah do not see the logic, then it is a valid excuse.

Consequently, historians are unanimous that Nabī Dāwūd عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام had nineteen sons. If it were material possessions to be inherited, then all nineteen were equally entitled. The verse which says that Nabī Sulaymān عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام inherited from Nabī Dāwūd عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام implies that he was the sole inheritor, to the exclusion of the remaining eighteen. This cannot be valid. Similarly, when inheritance must pass on from father to son, then what is the purpose of saying this? Such interpretations render the word of Allah meaningless.

Similarly, since the discussion in this chapter revolves around the merits of Nabī Sulaymān عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام what merit is highlighted in saying that he inherited from his father when all sons—pious or impious—inherit from their father's wealth.

1 Sūrah al-Naml: 16.

Therefore, inheritance cannot refer to wealth and material possessions. It must now be ascertained what the inheritance of the Ambiyā' is, because in the light of the above two verses it surely cannot be wealth and material possessions. In order to solve this, we first refer to the 'infallible' Imāms and see what they say on this matter. We receive the following response from them:

ان سليمان ورث داود و ان محمد صلى الله عليه و سلم ورث سليمان

Verily Sulaymān inherited from Dāwūd, and Muḥammad inherited from Sulaymān.

Al-Kulaynī records the above narration on the authority of Imām Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq. Had the Ahl al-Sunnah recorded such statements then the Shīʿah could have objected. Nevertheless, it is established that the inheritance in this case refers to knowledge and Nubuwwah, because there was no blood relation between the Prophet ﷺ and Nabī Sulaymān عليه السلام. Similarly, if it was wealth, then when did the Prophet ﷺ receive it? Therefore, the inheritance of Nabī Dāwūd عليه السلام to Nabī Sulaymān عليه السلام was knowledge and Nubuwwah, and this is the same two which the Prophet ﷺ received.

The context of this verse

The context of this verse and the verses before and after it clarify that inheritance refers to knowledge and Nubuwwah, not wealth. Any ḥāfiẓ, who knows basic Arabic, is aware of this; but I will record it for the benefit of others. Consequently, the verse before this is:

وَلَقَدْ اٰتَيْنَا دَاودَ وَ سُلَيْمٰنَ عِلْمًا وَ قَالَا الْحَمْدُ لِلّٰهِ الَّذِىْ فَضَّلَنَا عَلٰى كَثِيْرٍ مِّنْ عِبَادِهِ الْمُؤْمِنِيْنَ

And we had certainly given to Dāwūd and Sulaymān knowledge, and they said, "Praise (is due) to Allah, who has favoured us over many of His believing servants."[1]

If this verse is joined with the next verse, it implies that Nabī Dāwūd عليه السلام and Nabī Sulaymān عليه السلام received knowledge from Allah. They thanked Allah on account of being favoured over many of His creation by virtue of this knowledge.

1 Sūrah al-Naml: 15.

The next verse says that Nabī Sulaymān عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ inherited from Nabī Dāwūd عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ and he said to the people:

وَ قَالَ يٰاَيُّهَا النَّاسُ عُلِّمْنَا مَنْطِقَ الطَّيْرِ وَ اُوْتِيْنَا مِنْ كُلِّ شَیْءٍ اِنَّ هٰذَا لَهُوَ الْفَضْلُ الْمُبِيْنُ

He said, "O people, we have been taught the language of birds, and we have been given from all things. Indeed, this is evident bounty."

Now consider that *Wa Waritha* (he inherited) is attached to "*And we had certainly given to Dāwūd*" and the verse "*He said, "O people we have been taught*" is attached to "And Sulaymān inherited Dāwūd". Since all are inter-connected and related to one another, it necessarily implies that *Wa Waritha* (he inherited) refers to knowledge, not wealth. Had this verse not been connected to each other then they would not have been attached to each other (by the conjunction "*waw*"). Those who have studied the discussion on *faṣl* and *waṣl* in the books, *Muṭawwal* and *Mukhtaṣar al-Maʿānī*, know well that the conjunction would not have featured if these were not interconnected. Therefore, the three sentences are connected and inheritance refers to nothing else but knowledge. Those who are familiar with the Qur'ān know that this is the case in many instances, but the Shīʿah are to be excused for ignorance of the Qur'ān.

Consider the following examples where inheritance can refer to nothing but knowledge:

Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ says:

ثُمَّ أَوْرَثْنَا الْكِتَابَ الَّذِيْنَ اصْطَفَيْنَا مِنْ عِبَادِنَا

Then we caused to inherit the Book those We have chosen of Our servants.[1]

Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ also says:

فَخَلَفَ مِنْ بَعْدِهِمْ خَلْفٌ وَّرِثُوا الْكِتٰبَ

But there followed them successors who inherited the Scripture...[2]

1 Sūrah al-Fāṭir: 32.

2 Sūrah al-Aʿrāf: 169.

The first verse means that we have given the book as inheritance to those of our servants whom we have chosen. The second verse also pertains to inheritance of the Book, i.e. knowledge.

However, it is possible that some foolish Shīʿī might consider the Book to be wealth (on account of its monetary value), and thereby deduce that inheritance refers to wealth. Whilst such an assumption is laughable and responding to it may be ridiculous but taking the level of understanding of the Shīʿah, it is inevitable.

Therefore, consider that the first verse is followed by the classification of people in three groups, i.e. "among them is he who wrongs himself, etc." The second verse is followed by:

يَأْخُذُوْنَ عَرَضَ هٰذَا الْاَدْنٰى

(while) taking the commodities of this life.

In the former case, "of our servants" establishes that the classification of people is in relation to them complying with the Book and following its teachings. Thus, some were oppressive to themselves, others, moderate and some excelled by the grace of Allah. This classification can only apply if inheritance refers to knowledge, not the monetary value of the binding and pages of the Book.

Similarly, *(while) taking the commodities of this life*—which follows on from the second verse—establishes that instead of holding on to the Book, they sold its teachings for trivial worldly gain and accepted bribery. This is supported by:

اَلَمْ يُؤْخَذْ عَلَيْهِمْ مِّيْثَاقُ الْكِتٰبِ اَنْ لَّا يَقُوْلُوْا عَلَى اللّٰهِ اِلَّا الْحَقَّ وَدَرَسُوْا مَا فِيْهِ ؕ

Was not the covenant of the Scripture taken from them that they would not say about Allah except the truth, and they studied what was in it.[1]

Consequently, they received bribes for selling knowledge, which establishes that the inheritance was knowledge. Nevertheless, this establishes that inheritance which occurs in the Qur'ān denotes knowledge.

1 Sūrah al-Aʿrāf: 169.

Inheritance also refers to a successor

Perhaps some Shīʿī may get technical and say that the reference of inheritance to wealth is its *ḥaqīqī* (actual) implication, whilst its reference to knowledge is its *majāzī* (metaphorical) connotation. And the general rule—which is the basis of his contention—is that the ḥaqīqī meaning cannot be averted for the majāzī one without a very valid reason. It is only acceptable when there are valid reasons.

Our response is that we do not accept that inheritance actually denotes wealth and that knowledge is its majāzī meaning. We assert that inheritance refers to wealth or knowledge, both are the ḥaqīqī meanings of this term. Therefore, inheritance denotes knowledge and wealth equally, and *Wārith* refers to a successor. In fact, if it is said that inheritance actually refers to one who assumes ownership and possession of something, then this meaning is in harmony with the actual connotation of inheritance. We will prove this shortly, Allah willing.

However, since the Fuqahā’ utilise this word in the context of possessions that have monetary value, it has been wrongly deduced that inheritance refers to material possessions only. The reality is that inheritance can refer to knowledge, it can refer to assuming a post, and it can refer to possessions having monetary value. The proof that inheritance has come to be confined to a particular connotation despite it not being restricted to that is the instance in the Qur’ān where inheritance cannot refer to knowledge because that which was received was wealth, but there are two differences between this instance and wealth received as inheritance. Firstly, unlike inheritance, this wealth was received from those who they had no familial ties with. Secondly, they received it from those who were following a religion other than Islam. Both these matters are in conflict with the principles of inheritance. Therefore, inheritance in this instance can only refer to succession and being successors, or it can refer to assuming control and possession of something. Consider the following verse:

وَ اَوْرَثْنَا الْقَوْمَ الَّذِيْنَ كَانُوْا يُسْتَضْعَفُوْنَ مَشَارِقَ الْاَرْضِ وَ مَغَارِبَهَا الَّتِىْ
بٰرَكْنَا فِيْهَا

And We caused the people who had been oppressed to inherit the eastern regions of the land and the western ones, which We had blessed.[1]

1 Sūrah al-Aʿrāf: 137.

Therefore, the Banī Isrā'īl 'inherited' from the nation of Firʿawn. And not only were there no familial ties between them, there was a difference in religion too. Assuming that some familial ties did exist, there is no dispute about them being disbelievers, thereby making inheritance unlawful. This establishes that inheritance can only refer to being successors in this instance. It cannot denote knowledge—which they claim is the majāzī connotation nor can it denote inheriting wealth, which they say is its ḥaqīqī meaning. Consider the following verse as another example:

إِنَّ الْأَرْضَ لِلّٰهِ يُوْرِثُهَا مَنْ يَشَاءُ مِنْ عِبَادِهِ ۖ وَالْعَاقِبَةُ لِلْمُتَّقِيْنَ

Indeed, the earth belongs to Allah. He causes to inherit it whom He wills of His servants. And the [best] outcome is for the righteous.[1]

In this instance too inheritance means, making them successors.

Inheritance denoting assuming control and possession of something

It is evident from the above that inheritance denotes succession. But if one were to consider carefully, inheritance actually denotes gaining possession and control over something. The following verse establishes this:

تِلْكَ الْجَنَّةُ الَّتِيْ نُوْرِثُ مِنْ عِبَادِنَا مَنْ كَانَ تَقِيًّا

That is Paradise, which we give as inheritance to those of Our servants who were fearing of Allah.[2]

In this instance, inheritance can only denote assuming possession and control since Paradise was not previously possessed by anyone, whereby those who abide in it could be referred to as successors. But if one says that it is referred to as the inheritance of Nabī Ādam عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام—as he dwelt there initially—then the response is that whilst the actual owner is alive, his possessions cannot be inherited.

Therefore, the all-encompassing meaning of inheritance, which applies in every situation, is assuming possession and control over something. Therefore, if we have a general meaning which is applicable in every context then why should we prefer the view that inheritance sometimes denotes its actual meaning and sometimes its metaphorical meaning.

1 Sūrah al-Aʿrāf: 128.

2 Sūrah Maryam: 63.

In addition to this, the laws of inheritance are age-old laws promulgated in every sharīʿah of every Nabī. Therefore, inheritance in the context of inheriting wealth can be *shari’* (legal) terminology, but the coining of a word for a specific meaning precedes legal terminology. Therefore, the meaning which it was actually intended to convey will always have preference over any legal connotation given to it later on. Nevertheless, we have established that inheritance denoting inheritance of wealth is its legal definition, its actual definition is something else.

Whilst being a legal definition, inheritance in most instances in the Qur’ān cannot denote inheritance of wealth. This establishes that its legal definition is also restricted; it has not become more dominant than the actual definition of the word. Actually, the only places in the Qur’ān where it could possibly denote its legal definition are the verses which the Shīʿah use to establish inheritance from Ambiyā’. However, the reality of that possibility has been exposed. So why divert from the primary meaning of a word to a secondary connotation? Yes, if inheritance, like ṣalāh and ṣawm, was a term initiated by Allah for a specific task, then it would have been a different matter altogether.

Consequently, we have established that knowledge and wealth are metaphoric meanings of inheritance.

Majāz Mutaʿāraf

If we assume—for a moment—that inheritance actually denotes inheritance of wealth and that succession in knowledge is its majāzī meaning then too there is no objection because this [majāz] is now classified as *Majāz Mutaʿāraf*[1], which is on par with the ḥaqīqī meaning. Similarly, the following two verses establish this:

ثُمَّ أَوْرَثْنَا الْكِتَابَ الَّذِيْنَ اصْطَفَيْنَا مِنْ عِبَادِنَا

Then we caused to inherit the Book those We have chosen of Our servants.[2]

فَخَلَفَ مِنْ بَعْدِهِمْ خَلْفٌ وَّرِثُوْا الْكِتٰبَ

But there followed them successors who inherited the Scripture...[3]

1 A metaphorical meaning which has become the commonly understood connotation of the word.

2 Sūrah al-Fāṭir: 32.

3 Sūrah al-Aʿrāf: 169.

There is no doubt about inheritance referring to succession in knowledge in the above two verses. One can have no reluctance about this matter and this is what is meant by Majāz Mutaʿāraf. Such a majāz is nothing less than the ḥaqīqī meaning and there can be no objection about giving preference to Majāz Mutaʿāraf over the ḥaqīqī meaning. And to go one level beyond this, there is no problem with giving preference to majāz—Mutaʿāraf or not—over ḥaqiqat, when there are reasons supporting it. If this is not permissible, then there would be no need for majāz at all and no use for it.

What supporting reason could be greater for leaving the ḥaqīqī meaning and adopting majāz then the ḥadīth of al-Kulaynī, in addition to other logical and rational reasons?

The narration of Al-Kulaynī

This narration also establishes that inheritance in the supplication of Nabī Zakariyyā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام and in the case of Nabī Sulaymān عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام cannot refer to wealth; instead it refers to knowledge. Consequently, the Shīʿah have no response to this narration and it seals the mouths. The narration is as follows:

> روي محمد بن يعقوب الرازي في الكافي عن ابي عبد الله الجعفر بن محمد الصادق عليه السلام انه قال ان العلماء ورثة الانبياء و ذلك ان الانبياء لم يرثوا و لم يورثوا درهما و لا دينارا و انما اورثوا احاديث من احاديثهم فمن اخذ بشيء منها فقد اخذ بحظ وافر
>
> Imām Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّٰهُ narrates that the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ said, "Verily the ʿUlamā' are the inheritors of the Ambiyā', that is because the Ambiyā' do not inherit nor do others inherit from them any dirhams or dīnārs; however, they inherit (from the Ambiyā') their aḥādīth. So, whoever holds onto a portion of it, has held onto a large share.

This narration clearly establishes that no one inherits wealth from the Ambiyā'. However, the ʿUlamā' inherit their knowledge. This is precisely the meaning of the ḥadīth which the Ahl al-Sunnah transmit from Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهُ. If ʿAmmār ʿAlī and other Shīʿī scholars regard it as a fabrication, then this narration should be classified the same. But if this is a Ṣādiq transmission, and then that is a transmission from Ṣiddīq. But liars don't like the truth. If they consider our

narration false, they may even consider Imām Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq false, or they may disassociate themselves from al-Kulaynī. Nevertheless, whether they accept or not, we have the highest regard for the statement of Imām Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq.

Consequently, on account of *Innamā*—which the Shīʿah also maintain denotes *Ḥaṣr* (confinement), as they contend in the verse:

إِنَّمَا وَلِيُّكُمُ اللّٰهُ

Verily your walī is Allah...[1]

—the Ambiyā' have left behind nothing besides knowledge. Therefore, the inheritance would denote knowledge in two Qur'ānic verses.

The Shīʿah are now at liberty to call this its ḥaqīqī meaning, or its majazī meaning or Majāz Mutaʿāraf. And if they wish to spite us and say that it is *Majāz Ghayr Mashhūr* and *Ghayr Mutaʿāraf*, we will gladly settle for that too. Since there are so many reasons for it not denoting wealth and there are so many factors demanding that it denotes knowledge this is surely the correct meaning, even if they refer to it as majāz. It has been established that it is a grave error to maintain that it denotes wealth and it is an interpretation which cannot be entertained.

It has thus been proven that in the verse relating to Nabī Sulaymān عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ, inheritance cannot be wealth; it must denote knowledge.

The same applies to the following verse; inheritance refers to knowledge not wealth:

فَهَبْ لِي مِنْ لَدُنْكَ وَلِيًّا يَرِثُنِي وَيَرِثُ مِنْ اٰلِ يَعْقُوبَ

So, give me from Yourself an heir, who will inherit me and inherit from the family of Yaʿqūb.[2]

The second narration from al-Kulaynī also affirms that inheritance refers to knowledge, not wealth. The example of this narration as a response to the Shīʿah is like the proverbial saying of being struck with one's own shoes on one's head.

1 Sūrah al-Mā'idah: 55.

2 Sūrah Maryam: 5, 6.

The supplication in Sūrah Maryam—a supplication for a successor (not necessarily a son)

Though the issue has been established but for the sake of delighting the Ahl al-Sunnah and frustrating the Shīʿah the following is worth considering. Consequently, if you look at the verse, *And Indeed, I fear the successors after me*, and the word *Walī* which is mentioned in the supplication, it becomes clear that Nabī Zakariyyā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ only sought a righteous and upright successor. When he made the supplication recorded in Sūrah Maryam, the desire was not there for a son, though he may have sought this at another juncture. Consequently, the word *Walī* according to linguists does not denote son; it denotes a successor and a deputy. This is also supported by the words *after me*. Consider the translation of these verses:

وَ اِنِّیْ خِفْتُ الْمَوَالِیَ مِنْ وَّ رَآءِیْ وَكَانَتِ امْرَاَتِیْ عَاقِرًا فَهَبْ لِیْ مِنْ لَّدُنْكَ
وَلِیًّا یَّرِثُنِیْ وَیَرِثُ مِنْ اٰلِ یَعْقُوْبَ وَ اجْعَلْهُ رَبِّ رَضِیًّا

And Indeed, I fear the successors after me (that they are not worthy of succession after me. If they were to assume authority after me then they would alter the laws of dīn. As for myself, I have no hope of children on account of my old age), and my wife has been barren, so (I appeal to you to) give me from Yourself an heir. Who will inherit me and inherit from the family of Yaʿqūb. And make him, my Rabb, pleasing (to You).[1]

It is evident that *Mawāli* in the above instance can only refer to successors and deputies. Therefore, *Walī*, which is a derivative from the same root letters, would also denote successor. And assuming that *Walī* means a son, then *Mawālī* (its plural) would mean sons, whereas Nabī Zakariyyā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ had no sons. If he had, why was he seeking another son, as all sons are entitled to inheritance, whether they are good or bad.

As for the possibility that the previous sons were not righteous and this supplication was for a noble and virtuous son, then (being a father) why not pray for their guidance and goodness? The same could be said about *Mawālī*; if they were not virtuous and righteous, he could have made the same supplication for their guidance instead of seeking a son. But there is a difference, one's feeling for one's own children on account of which one's supplication are heartfelt cannot apply

1 Sūrah Maryam: 5, 6.

equally to other relatives. However, the Shīʿah are also aware that Nabī Zakariyyā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ had no sons until the moment of his supplication, righteous or misguided. Therefore *Mawālī* "الْمَوَالِيَ" would necessarily refer to those whom he considered his possible successors.

Similarly, it seems apparent that the successor whom he was seeking was one who was not necessarily from his own progeny as he expressed his inability to have a child. Therefore, the 'inheritance' must denote knowledge, not wealth. And if this is not the case then the fact that *Walī* means successor is sufficient to conclude that 'inheritance' refers to knowledge, not wealth.

As for the word *Dhurriyyah*—which refers to children and progeny—appearing in the supplication of Nabī Zakariyyā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ at another instance[1], it does not determine that when making the supplication in Sūrah Maryam he was also seeking a son. He may have made different supplications on different occasions. It is possible that when he made the supplication recorded in Sūrah Maryam, he was despondent of having children and he asked for a successor instead. However, Allah was merciful to him and showed him that He had provided unseasonal fruits for Sayyidah Maryam رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا and this spurred him on to pray for a child. Therefore, he may have made different supplications in different conditions and the verse under discussion cannot be conclusively a supplication for a son.

Similarly, *Dhurriyyah* does not have to refer to biological children. A compassionate teacher or Shaykh may refer to his students or associates as his children. And a father sometimes disowns a rebellious child and says that he is not his son. In fact, Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ has dismissed the biological relationship between Nabī Nūḥ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ and his son on account of his son's unworthiness. Similarly, Allah has referred to the followers of Nabī Nūḥ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ as his family and he commanded him to board a pair of every kind of animal and his family of the ark. Thus, his family refers to his followers and his relatives only because it is not possible that arrangements were made for animals and not for the Muslims of his era.

---

1 Sūrah Āl ʿImrān: 38:

هُنَالِكَ دَعَا زَكَرِيَّا رَبَّهُ قَالَ رَبِّ هَبْ لِي مِنْ لَدُنْكَ ذُرِّيَّةً طَيِّبَةً إِنَّكَ سَمِيعُ الدُّعَاءِ

At that, Zakariyyā called upon his Rabb, saying: "My Rabb, grant me from Yourself a good offspring. Indeed, You are the Hearer of supplication."

Based on the above it is very possible that *Dhurriyyah*—in the supplication of Nabī Zakariyyā عَلَيۡهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ—refers to followers. It is also common in Arabic to refer to one's group using the word *Dhurriyyah* or *Āl*.

However, it is only fair to concede that *Dhurriyyah* in Sūrah Āl ʿImrān refers to children, but *Walī* in Sūrah Maryam does not necessarily refer to a son. If it can be proven that Nabī Zakariyyā عَلَيۡهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ supplicated once only, then it would be fair to say that he supplicated for a son only. However, since there are two versions of the supplication in two different sūrah's, it is justified to presume that multiple prayers were made. So why it is necessary to maintain that *Walī* refers to a son.

Yes, if considering any other meaning besides a son would render the sentence meaningless then it would have been a valid reason to rule out other possibilities. But in this case, considering it to mean a son has a negative bearing on the meaning since he says:

And my wife has been barren.

Nevertheless, *Walī* refers to *Walī ʿAhd*, i.e. a successor, on account of which inheritance would refer to knowledge not wealth. This clarifies the purpose of using the word *Walī*. Due to the above and the narration of al-Kulaynī, it is clear that inheritance denotes succeeding him in knowledge and in his position. This eradicates any misgivings about the ḥadīth of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنۡهُ conflicting with the two Qur'ānic verses. In fact, the ḥadīth is in harmony with the Qur'ān. Similarly, based on the discussion on *Allah instructs you all* and *And what Allah restored*, even if this ḥadīth is invalid it has no bearing on the Ahl al-Sunnah as elaborated earlier on. Conversely, the Shīʿah will soon realise that the ḥadīth of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنۡهُ is supported by their own aḥādīth reports.

The Ḥadīth of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr—stronger than Tawātur

Since it has been established that the ḥadīth of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنۡهُ is not contradicting the Qur'ān there is no need to further verify its authenticity, but for the sake of establishing the integrity of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنۡهُ we will pursue the discussion.

Firstly, to say that this ḥadīth is transmitted by one person only is invalid criticism because this only applies where the narrator has not heard the statement from the primary source directly. As for one who heard a statement from the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ directly, his transmission is stronger than a thousand reports of those who did not hear it directly. Excessive transmission is deemed necessary to avert the possibility of lies, but when a person hears it directly then there is no need for excessive transmission. Therefore, though thousands may report a matter and it gives one some degree of conviction, it can never give the conviction that is derived from witnessing it personally. Therefore, though there are thousands of reports from people about Makkah, Delhi, London etc., the benefit of seeing it personally and hearing about it cannot be the same. So, when the sight of others cannot be equal to one's vision, the hearing of others cannot be equal to one's own hearing.

Therefore, the Shīʿī objection to Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهُ for practising on something which he heard personally—and no one else heard it besides him—reflects the flaw in their understanding. Every literate and illiterate Muslim knows that it was binding on a Ṣaḥābī to act upon a ḥadīth which he heard personally from the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, whether others heard it or not.

Shīʿah and Sunnī scholars of *Uṣūl al-Ḥadīth* are unanimous that the classification of a ḥadīth as Mutawātir, Mash-hūr, Khabr al-Wahid, etc., has relevance when those who transmit the ḥadīth did not hear the ḥadīth directly or witness the event personally. It has no relevance to those who heard it directly or who were eye witnesses to the events. The direct narration of a Ṣaḥābī from the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ is far weightier than a Mutawātir transmission. Thus, Sayyidunā Abū Bakr practised upon what he heard. Therefore, this objection has no basis, unless of course one has no faith in Abū Bakr as-Ṣiddīq, which is a different issue altogether.

Multiple transmissions of this Ḥadīth

However, if we have to speak to people on their level of understanding, then so be it. If multiple transmissions of a ḥadīth makes it authentic, and not hearing it personally, then take note of the following; just as there are instances when a ḥadīth would be considered invalid—when the narrators are liars and when the content blatantly conflicts *naql* (narration) or *ʿaql* (logic), similarly there are two instances which render a ḥadīth valid, namely the integrity of the narrators are

beyond any doubt and it is supported by the Qur'ān, authentic aḥādīth, i.e. naql and/or ʿaql.

In the same manner, if a ḥadīth is transmitted by very few individuals and that ḥadīth conflicts minimally or substantially with more authentic aḥādīth, then the reliability of that narration would be compromised relevantly. Similarly, if a ḥadīth has profuse transmission and it is in harmony with authentic aḥādīth then its reliability would be enhanced proportionately.

We have, thus, outlined the two instances when a ḥadīth would be considered valid as well as the two factors affecting the reliability of a ḥadīth.

Considering multiple transmissions, this ḥadīth is not reported by Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه alone. There are more than ten other narrators of such integrity like has never been. Therefore, the criticism of the Shīʿah—which ʿAmmār ʿAlī ignorantly records—about Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه denying Fadak on account of hearing a ḥadīth is false and baseless. Consequently, the ḥadīth is recorded in Sunnī references on the authority of Zubayr ibn al-ʿAwwām, Ḥudhayfah ibn al-Yamān, Abū al-Dardā', Abū Hurayrah, ʿAbbās, ʿAlī, ʿUthmān, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn ʿAwf, Saʿd ibn Abī Waqqās, Sayyidah ʿĀ'ishah, ʿUmar al-Fārūq and Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنهم.

Now if the Shīʿah do not accept the transmission of ʿĀ'ishah, Abū Bakr, ʿUmar and ʿUthmān رضي الله عنهم, then what about the rest. Have they committed any crime besides speaking the truth in a matter which is highly sensitive to the Shīʿah? But we plead with them not to ruin themselves just out of spite for the Ahl al-Sunnah. Consequently, are they not aware of the fact that rejecting the words of an infallible Imām renders a Shīʿī a non-Muslim. Therefore, in order to remain Shīʿah they must accept the ḥadīth as it is transmitted by Sayyidunā ʿAlī رضي الله عنه too.

Similarly, rejecting the transmission of Sayyidunā Ḥudhayfah رضي الله عنه has negative consequences as well. Although he is not an infallible Imām, but in this case his transmission is no less than that of an infallible Imām. This is because Mullah ʿAbd Allāh Shahīd records the ḥadīth of the Prophet ﷺ in *Iẓhār al-Ḥaqq*, which is as follows:

ما حدثكم به حذيفة فصدقوه

Attest to whatever Ḥudhayfah narrates to you.

Evidence from Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī

Just in case someone doubts that this ḥadīth is actually transmitted from Sayyidunā ʿAlī رضي الله عنه, I record the narration of *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, which is the most authentic book after the Qur'ān. It is as follows, narrated by Mālik ibn Aws:

حدثنا إسحاق بن محمد الفروي، حدثنا مالك بن أنس، عن ابن شهاب، عن مالك بن أوس بن الحدثان، وكان، محمد بن جبير ذكر لي ذكرا من حديثه ذلك، فانطلقت حتى أدخل على مالك بن أوس، فسألته عن ذلك الحديث فقال مالك بينا أنا جالس في أهلي حين متع النهار، إذا رسول عمر بن الخطاب يأتيني فقال أجب أمير المؤمنين. فانطلقت معه حتى أدخل على عمر، فإذا هو جالس على رمال سرير، ليس بينه وبينه فراش متكئ على وسادة من أدم، فسلمت عليه ثم جلست فقال يا مالك ، إنه قدم علينا من قومك أهل أبيات، وقد أمرت فيهم برضخ فاقبضه فاقسمه بينهم. فقلت يا أمير المؤمنين، لو أمرت به غيري. قال اقبضه أيها المرء. فبينا أنا جالس عنده أتاه حاجبه يرفا فقال هل لك في عثمان وعبد الرحمن بن عوف والزبير وسعد بن أبي وقاص يستأذنون قال نعم. فأذن لهم فدخلوا فسلموا وجلسوا، ثم جلس يرفا يسيرا ثم قال هل لك في علي وعباس قال نعم. فأذن لهما، فدخلا فسلما فجلسا، فقال عباس يا أمير المؤمنين، اقض بيني وبين هذا. وهما يختصمان فيما أفاء الله على رسوله صلى الله عليه وسلم من بني النضير. فقال الرهط عثمان وأصحابه يا أمير المؤمنين، اقض بينهما وأرح أحدهما من الآخر. قال عمر تيدكم، أنشدكم بالله الذي بإذنه تقوم السماء والأرض، هل تعلمون أن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم قال "لا نورث ما تركنا صدقة". يريد رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم نفسه. قال الرهط قد قال ذلك. فأقبل عمر على علي وعباس فقال أنشدكما الله، أتعلمان أن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم قد قال ذلك قالا قد قال ذلك.

While I was at home, the sun rose high and it got hot. Suddenly the messenger of ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb came to me and said, "The chief of the believers has sent for you."

So, I went along with him till I entered the place where ʿUmar was sitting on a bedstead made of date-palm leaves and covered with no mattress, and he was leaning over a leather pillow. I greeted him and sat down.

He said, "O Malik, some persons of your people who have families came to me and I have ordered that a gift should be given to them, so take it and distribute it among them."

I said, "O chief of the believers, I wish that you order someone else to do it."

He said, "O man! Take it."

While I was sitting there with him, his doorman Yarfa' came saying, "ʿUthmān, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn ʿAwf, al-Zubayr and Saʿd ibn Abi Waqqās are asking your permission to see you; may I admit them?"

ʿUmar said, "Yes."

So, they were admitted and they came in, greeted him, and sat down. After a while Yarfa' came again and said, "May I admit ʿAlī and ʿAbbās?"

ʿUmar said, "Yes."

So, they were admitted and they came in and greeted him and sat down.

Then ʿAbbās said, "O chief of the believers! Judge between me and him (i.e. ʿAlī)."

They had a dispute regarding the property of Banū al-Naḍīr which Allah had given to His Prophet as Fay'.

The group, i.e. ʿUthmān and his companions said, "O chief of the believers, judge between them and relieve both of them of each other."

ʿUmar said, "Be patient! I beseech you by Allah by Whose Permission the Heaven and the Earth exist, do you know that Allah's Messenger ﷺ said, 'Our (i.e. Prophets') property will not be inherited, and whatever we leave, is Ṣadaqah, and Allah's Messenger ﷺ meant himself (by saying 'we')?"

The group said, "He said so."

ʿUmar then turned to ʿAlī and ʿAbbās and said, "I beseech you by Allah, do you know that Allah's Messenger ﷺ said so?"

They replied, "He said so."[1]

1 *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, Ḥadīth: 3094.

It is evident from this narration that Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهُ transmits this ḥadīth. Therefore, if they were reluctant to accept this ḥadīth because of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهُ transmitting it alone, then there is the testimony of so many Ṣaḥābah. And if they claim that it is in conflict with the Qur'ān, then that is their short-sightedness and the reality is somewhat different, as elaborated on earlier. Similarly, if they object because he heard it directly from the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ then that issue has also been dealt with; one's seeing or hearing is conclusive.

This ḥadīth is transmitted by so many Ṣaḥābah that it is rare to find aḥādīth like this. Similarly, most of them are from the ʿAsharah Mubasharah. In fact, its transmission by Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهُ is equivalent to the transmission of hundreds of thousands of narrators—especially according to the Shīʿah. Therefore, there can be no doubt about the validity of this ḥadīth.

Therefore, the Shīʿah should consider this ḥadīth no less in weight than a Qur'ānic verse. Then how was it possible for Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهُ to dismiss this ḥadīth and not act upon it? As for the Ahl al-Sunnah, its transmission by such esteemed Ṣaḥābah makes it as conclusive as the Qur'ān. Every individual Ṣaḥābī among them is so esteemed that his transmission is weightier than Mutawātir, so what can be said about them collectively.

As for its conformance with the Qur'ān, it is evident. The Shīʿah were demonstrating on account of *Yūsīkum Allāh* (Allah instructs you all), but is has been proven that the Ḥadīth is in harmony with the verse.

No contradiction between Qur'ān and Ḥadīth

If any one feels that there is contradiction between the ḥadīth and the Qur'ān, then it is feared that such fools may go on to criticise the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ in another matter. They may consider the aḥādīth which forbid zakāh and Ṣadaqah upon the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ in conflict with the following verse:

إِنَّمَا الصَّدَقَاتُ لِلْفُقَرَاءِ وَالْمَسَاكِيْنِ وَالْعَامِلِيْنَ عَلَيْهَا وَالْمُؤَلَّفَةِ قُلُوْبُهُمْ
وَفِيْ الرِّقَابِ وَالْغَارِمِيْنَ وَفِيْ سَبِيْلِ اللّٰهِ وَابْنِ السَّبِيْلِ فَرِيْضَةً مِنَ اللّٰهِ

Zakāh expenditures are only for the poor and for the needy and for those employed to collect [zakāh] and for bringing hearts together [for Islam] and for freeing captives [or

slaves] and for those in debt and for the cause of Allah and for the [stranded] traveller - an obligation [imposed] by Allah.[1]

Therefore, they may accuse the Prophet ﷺ of opposing this verse. Consequently, the Prophet's ﷺ 'poverty' is well-known and his prayer to remain in humble conditions till the end of his life and be raised with those people is also well-known. Therefore, if he was the Leader of the people of less-means in this world then he was most deserving of ṣadaqah and zakāh.

Similarly, there is no exclusion or takhṣīṣ in the verse above, whereby he is to be considered exempted. Unlike *Yūsīkum Allāh* (Allah instructs you all), where the tone of address is to the Ummah and there is evidence of the Prophet's ﷺ exclusion from that.

However, when both the Ahl al-Sunnah and Shīʿah are unanimous that the aḥādīth prohibiting charity for the Prophet ﷺ are not in conflict with the verse, *Zakāh expenditures are only for the poor*, then the ḥadīth—what we leave behind is ṣadaqah—is in greater harmony with the Qur'ānic verse. This is because the Prophet's ﷺ exclusion from the law of inheritance is understood from the context of the sūrah and the tone of *Yūsīkum Allāh* (Allah instructs you all) itself, whereas the exclusion of the Prophet ﷺ from charity is not understood from *Zakāh expenditures are only for the poor*.

If anything does establish his exclusion than it can possibly be the verse:

وَمِنْهُمْ مَنْ يَلْمِزُكَ فِيْ الصَّدَقَاتِ فَإِنْ أُعْطُوْا مِنْهَا رَضُوْا وَإِنْ لَمْ يُعْطَوْا مِنْهَا إِذَا هُمْ يَسْخَطُوْنَ

And among them are some who criticise you concerning the (distribution of) charities. If they are given from them, they approve; but if they are not given from them, at once they become angry.[2]

which does not even appear directly before or after this. However, it is possible to extract the exclusion from it. The meaning is as follows; this verse establishes that the Prophet ﷺ was authorised to distribute charity. The verse *Zakāh*

1 Sūrah al-Tawbah: 60.

2 Sūrah al-Tawbah: 58.

expenditures are only for the poor establishes that charity is for the poor and the destitute and that the hypocrites do not have rights over it. Therefore, since the Prophet ﷺ was appointed to distribute it and the needy and destitute were declared the recipients and the hypocrites were to be dismissed, it implies that the Prophet ﷺ was excluded from receiving anything from it. This is just how a person entrusts a person who is needy himself with the task of distributing something to poor people and to omit the wealthy. It is commonly understood that the person entrusted with the task is not supposed to receive anything. (This is the practical illustration of the above verses.) Consequently, this is the reason why *for the Rasūl* has been mentioned explicitly in the verse of Khums and Fay'—to establish that along with the duty of distribution, the Prophet ﷺ is entitled to his independent share.

Nevertheless, the Prophet's ﷺ exclusion from *Zakāh expenditures are only for the poor* is by an external factor and a verse disconnected from it. As for his exclusion from *Yūsīkum Allāh* (Allah instructs you all), his exclusion is established from the verse itself and internal factors. Therefore, if the aḥādīth prohibiting zakāh are established and they are not in conflict with *Zakāh expenditures are only for the poor* then "what we leave behind is ṣadaqah," is also established and in greater harmony with *Yūsīkum Allāh* (Allah instructs you all).

Similarly, "what we leave behind is ṣadaqah," is also not in conflict with *an heir, who will inherit me and And Sulaymān inherited Dāwūd*, because the verses refer to inheriting the legacy of knowledge whilst the ḥadīth refutes inheritance of wealth. This discussion has been recorded in detail already.

As for the narration, "what we leave behind is ṣadaqah," conforming to other authentic aḥādīth it must be said that this ḥadīth enjoys such prestige that the Ahl al-Sunnah do not regard it necessary for it to conform to other narrations. It is a criterion by itself. Despite this, it has multiple transmissions and all its chains are authentic and this is what is meant by conforming to authentic narrations.

As for the authenticity of a ḥadīth, it is determined by the soundness of the chain of transmission. Similarly, multiple chains of transmission constitute multiple aḥādīth (even though the content is the same). Therefore, if one text is transmitted via multiple chains then each chain would be considered an independent ḥadīth. Now that multiple transmissions has given us multiple aḥādīth—with slight variation

in wording in some—and each one is in harmony with the other then it would be said that "what we leave behind is ṣadaqah," is in harmony with authentic aḥādīth.

Shīʿī reports in substantiation

However, if the above evidence leaves anyone in doubt then it is surely the Shīʿah. They need greater evidence; evidence from their texts that this ḥadīth is in harmony with authentic narrations. Therefore, Shīʿī scholars and laity are aware that no book has greater standing than the *al-Kāfī* of al-Kulaynī. Have we not alluded to the ḥadīth recorded therein transmitted on the authority of Abū al-Bakhtarī from Imām Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq which states the following:

> ان العلماء ورثة الانبياء و ذلك ان الانبياء لم يرثوا و لم يورثوا درهما و لا دينارا و انما اورثوا احاديث من احاديثهم فمن اخذ بشيء منها فقد اخذ بحظ وافر
>
> Verily the ʿUlamā' are the inheritors of the Ambiyā', that is because the Ambiyā' do not inherit nor do others inherit from them any dirhams or dīnārs; however, they inherit (from the Ambiyā') their aḥādīth. So, whoever holds onto a portion of it, has held onto a large share.

Consequently, this narration establishes exactly what is established from the narration of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ. In fact, on account of the devious nature of the Shīʿah, Imām Jaʿfar رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ says that the legacy of Ambiyā' is knowledge. Therefore, if the version, "we are not inherited from," is considered then it implies that none inherits from them except the ʿUlamā', who inherit their knowledge. This is because the Ambiyā' also have not inherited fortunes from anyone. If the version, "the Ambiyā' do not inherit," is considered it implies that the ʿUlamā' inherit their knowledge because they have not left behind wealth as inheritance. As for Fadak, it was not the Prophet's صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ personal possession as has been elaborated on previously.

Personal effects

As for other personal effects such as clothing, home and conveyance; the following should be noted: the homes of the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, which were simple rooms, were already in the possession of the noble wives according to the declaration of the Qur'ān. Consequently, Allah said:

And abide in your houses.[1]

and He did not say, "in the homes of the Nabī". It is thus established that these rooms belonged to them and that the Prophet ﷺ gave it to them.

However, someone could say that when speaking about the home one lives in, one refers to it as one's own home despite it being rented or actually belonging to someone else. Therefore, it is not necessarily the case that those rooms belonged to them.

Well, we do not have a problem with that because even if it belonged to the Prophet ﷺ till the end of his life it becomes charity immediately thereafter and the noble wives assumed authority over it just like how Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها received revenue from Fadak.

Nevertheless, we are not concerned with the technicalities revolving around the word, "your houses," we are only concerned about keeping the contents of the ḥadīth of Imām Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq in mind. So, if the Shīʿah have a problem with the meaning which we understand from the verse, then so be it. Either way, the homes were not the Prophet's ﷺ property or inheritance upon his departure from this world.

Yes, from his personal effects they may ask about his clothing and conveyance. However, one's īmān demands that since Imām Jaʿfar uses the word *Innamā* which denotes *ḥaṣr*—his legacy was nothing else but knowledge. Therefore, there should be no reservations at all. Whilst the Prophet ﷺ may have left clothing behind, it is possible that he gifted it to someone in his lifetime and used it as a loan as long as he required it.

Even if this does not make sense to you, do not refute the words of the infallible Imām. Consider it a deficiency of your understanding instead. But for the sake of clarification for the Muslims it must be noted that "the Ambiyā' do not inherit" does not mean that they did not leave any material possessions behind; it means that they did not leave anything inheritable. This makes it clear why the ḥadīth of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq رضي الله عنه, "what we leave behind is ṣadaqah," is correct.

1 Sūrah al-Aḥzāb: 33.

Since Imām Jaʿfar was aware of the contents of this hadith, he added the word *Innamā* to reinforce this meaning.

Therefore, if we analyse both narrations then the narration of Imām Jaʿfar conveys the exact meaning of the narration of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq رضي الله عنه since he says that the Ambiyā' do not leave any material possessions for inheritance. Actually, his narration expresses that they have only left behind knowledge and this fact is not contained in the narration of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه. Therefore, the ḥadīth of Imām Jaʿfar expresses two matters whilst the ḥadīth of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه expresses one only. Imām Jaʿfar's رحمه الله narration has substantiation as well so that his claim bears more weight. Whilst he was at ease about the Ahl al-Sunnah, he was apprehensive of the Shīʿah misunderstanding or distorting his words, so he clarified it thoroughly.

But it is no wonder that the Shīʿah have forfeited their īmān by rejecting the words of their Imām. They are even capable of disowning their own Imāms. Only Allah can make them understand as no Shaykh, Imām, Ṣaḥābī or Nabī can achieve this. They should be ashamed of themselves; criticising the Ṣaḥābah on behalf of those who were in harmony and accord with the Ṣaḥābah. They have lost the celestial light of īmān by vilifying the Ṣaḥābah and they have lost īmān itself by rejecting their Imāms. This is because they maintain that one who rejects the words of an infallible Imām is a kāfir, and if this is transmitted in the most authentic book of *al-Kāfī*, then what can be said. Nevertheless, the ḥadīth "what we leave behind is ṣadaqah," is correct and in harmony with Shīʿī ḥadīth reports.

The second Ḥadīth of al-Kulaynī

The above Shīʿī narration is supported by a second ḥadīth, which also appears in *al-Kāfī*. The ḥadīth, which has passed earlier on along with its translation is as follows:

ان سليمان ورث داود و ان محمد صلى الله عليه و سلم ورث سليمان

> Verily Sulaymān inherited from Dāwūd, and Muḥammad inherited from Sulaymān.

It is evident from this that the inheritance of the Ambiyā' is nothing else but knowledge. The discussions relating to this ḥadīth have been submitted earlier on but we will make a brief reference to two logical evidences recorded earlier.

Firstly, the Ambiyā' are alive in their graves and the possessions of a living person cannot be inherited by anyone. However, if the nature of those possessions is such that they cannot benefit from personally then their directives regarding it must be adhered to by their successors. Therefore, since the Prophet ﷺ is alive in his grave—and this has been established—his material possessions are not inheritable. It was therefore the responsibility of his successor, who in this case happens to be Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه, to carry out his orders regarding it and these are contained in the statement, "what we leave behind is ṣadaqah". If some sceptic denies the life of the Ambiyā' in their graves, then there is a second logical evidence which is as follows: inheritance cannot apply to the material possessions of the Ambiyā' due to their strong conviction that everything belongs solely Allah and it was entrusted to them to use for a specific time like an item that has been borrowed. Therefore, when their time lapsed and they returned to Allah, their possession of it was relinquished instantaneously. Nevertheless, these two logical arguments have been discussed at length.

The share of other shareholders

Whilst it is contested whether Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه withheld Fadak rightfully or oppressively it must be noted that he gave no share of it to Sayyidah ʿĀ'ishah رضي الله عنها. Similarly, Sayyidunā ʿUmar رضي الله عنه did not give any share of it to Sayyidah Ḥafṣah رضي الله عنها. The laws of inheritance demand that both of them should have received a share as they were the wives of the Prophet ﷺ. This establishes that not giving them was in conformance with the instruction of the Prophet ﷺ; it was not withheld oppressively from anyone. If they really did oppress Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها then they surely would not have oppressed their own daughters.

Similarly, those who snatch the wealth and possessions of others are not characterised by abstention from this world and worldly things. Therefore, it makes no sense that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه usurped Fadak but he did not benefit in any way from it nor did he allow his relatives to benefit from it. This also establishes that withholding it was in accordance with the injunction of the Prophet ﷺ. Perhaps the Shīʿah accuse him of fraud due to saying that a man judges' others by his own standards.

The Ahl al-Bayt and the possessions of the Prophet ﷺ

Whilst they do criticise Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه, they do not level any criticism against the Ahl al-Bayt on the same matter. Let us take a moment to analyse their activities in this regard.

Consequently, each one of them from Sayyidunā ʿAlī رضي الله عنه till the last of them assumed administration of it without giving the wives of the Prophet ﷺ or the family of ʿAbbās رضي الله عنه any share from it. If the Prophet's ﷺ possessions were inheritable then his wives and ʿAbbās رضي الله عنهم were entitled to half of it. Why then did these infallible Imāms tread on the path of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq? If Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه committed an error then it was possible for him to do so, but what calamity befell the infallible Imāms, leading them to such oppression?

Consequently, historians and ḥadīth scholars are unanimous that Fadak was under the control of Sayyidunā ʿAlī and Sayyidunā ʿAbbās رضي الله عنهما during the era of Sayyidunā ʿUmar رضي الله عنه. Sayyidunā ʿAlī رضي الله عنه then assumed control to the exclusion of Sayyidunā ʿAbbās رضي الله عنه. It then went to Sayyidunā Ḥasan and then to Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رضي الله عنهما. Next came Imām Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn رحمه الله and Ḥasan ibn Ḥasan رحمه الله. Thereafter it went to Sayyidunā Zayd ibn Ḥasan—the son of Sayyidunā Ḥasan رضي الله عنه—thereafter it went to the sons of Marwan and remained in their possession until ʿUmar ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz arrived. He released all rights and restored it to its original condition.

Thus, the practice of the illustrious Imāms proves that the material possessions of the Prophet ﷺ are not subjected to inheritance. Instead, it was Waqf. This explains why the infallible Imāms withheld it from the inheritors and this establishes that the ḥadīth of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه (what we leave behind is ṣadaqah) is legitimate and sound.

Similarly, Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه withholding it from Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها is just like the infallible Imāms withholding it from the wives of the Prophet ﷺ. In fact, the integrity of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه seems purer than the integrity of the infallible Imāms in the light of a criticism which can be levelled against them from the Khawārij. The Khawārij could say that they withheld it as they had their vested interests on account of being direct legitimate heirs. As for Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه, he had no vested interests as he was not entitled to any part of it. But despite the purity of his integrity, the Shīʿah have not failed to say that he changed

colours immediately upon the demise of the Prophet ﷺ and denied Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها what was lawfully hers.

Nevertheless, whilst Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه withheld Fadak and the infallible Imāms also withheld it, there is a greater degree of dedication from Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه. In fact, his steadfastness upon the truth must be lauded for despite his devotion to the Ahl al-Bayt and despite seeing the displeasure of Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها—which is sufficient to make anyone compromise—he conformed with the directive of the Prophet ﷺ. The Shīʿah, however, are blinded by their enmity and disbelief.

Therefore, Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه complied with the prophetic injunction and there is no doubt that the ḥadīth which he practised upon is valid. Consequently, the detailed analysis of its authenticity has passed and there is no room for doubt. This establishes that ʿAmmār ʿAlī's comments about this ḥadīth are baseless. He says the following:

> **In addition to this narration contradicting the Qur'ān, the Prophet of Allah neither informed his daughter or any of his wives that his wealth would be disposed of in charity and they would have nothing of it, so they should not lay claims to it. How could the Messenger of Allah conceal this divine injunction from those concerned and reveal it to a stranger who has no one else to verify this report.**

It has been established that what he claims to be in conflict with the Qur'an is actually in perfect harmony with it. As for claiming that it was transmitted to one Ṣaḥābī only, it has been established that more than ten Ṣaḥābah transmit it, including Sayyidunā ʿAlī, Sayyidunā ʿAbbās, and Sayyidah ʿĀ'ishah رضي الله عنهم. Allah alone knows how many others heard this prophetic statement but did not have the opportunity to relate it. But if Molvī Ammar is unaware of these facts then what are we supposed to do about that. He either seems to be in a state of ignorance or intentional failure to acknowledge the reality.

As for saying that none of the inheritors were informed about this, if this statement is made in ignorance than he must be alerted to the reality. If someone is unaware of something it does not necessarily imply that the particular matter had not occurred. Nevertheless, his allegation would have been correct if Sayyidunā ʿAbbās and Sayyidah ʿĀ'ishah رضي الله عنهما were not inheritors. As for Sayyidunā ʿAlī, whilst he was

not a direct inheritor but the most important person in this matter on account of his representation of Sayyidah Fāṭimah and on account of him possibly inheriting from her—transmitting the ḥadīth to him is more appropriate than transmitting it to Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا. In addition to this, speaking about matters related to death to one's closest relatives causes anguish and more so in the case of a daughter whose feelings for her father are most intense. Therefore, if the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ had to openly tell Sayyidah Fāṭimah that she was entitled to nothing of his worldly possessions after his demise—as ʿAmmār ʿAlī suggests—when the thought of his demise would already cause immense grief than would it be prudent or not to divulge this unfavourable news to her as well?

The Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ was fully aware of the fact that if Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا took the initiative of addressing this matter with Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ—whom he knew with certainty would be his successor—without the knowledge of Sayyidunā ʿAlī, then Abū Bakr would never be so weak as to compromise the truth. Similarly, he also knew that Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا would also not be so persistent about inheritance and ignore the truth which was related to her by Ṣiddīq al-Akbar.

Since it is humanly possible to err just as Mūsā عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ erred when he took Hārūn عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ to task, and if on account of this possibility Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا disputed the issue after hearing the ḥadīth, then Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ was always there to reassure her that the matter is at it stands.

Therefore, the claim that the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ did not inform any of his inheritors is fraudulent and deceptive.

Fāṭimah and ʿIlm al-Ghayb

Actually, the allegation of concealing the ḥadīth from Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا makes no sense at all. This is because there is no way something could have remained hidden from Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا; she is after all no less than the Imāms of the Ahl al-Bayt in any way. If the Imāms have all-encompassing knowledge of past and present matters than Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا shares this characteristic. Therefore, it would be actually better to say that the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ felt that there was no need to tell her because only those need to be told who are unaware.

However, if the commandments of the sharīʿah are considered an exception from the all-encompassing knowledge of the Imāms, or if Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا is

considered inferior to them in this respect then too the allegation of concealment is invalid, because if a few people from one group are informed of something it is just as good as everyone knowing about it. Therefore, when the merits of propagating knowledge are so profuse then how could it be possible for this command of sharīʿah to remain obscure. After all, the Prophet ﷺ was not responsible for passing every message individually to every Muslim; he related information to some and the word gradually got around to the rest. Yes, if he had not charged those whom he had related the ḥadīth to with the responsibility of propagating it to everyone then it could be said that law of the sharīʿah was kept hidden.

Since it was most appropriate to convey this information to Ṣiddīq al-Akbar, the Prophet ﷺ did just that. Similarly, it is evident that giving and receiving are two actions carried out by two individuals. If one party does not act, giving and taking cannot materialise. Therefore, by alerting one of the two parties, the act of giving and receiving would not occur. This is why it was sufficient to relate this information to Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه, as he would be responsible for giving in this instance.

It could be said that based on this philosophy of giving and receiving it would have been better to relate the ḥadīth to Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها, who is the possible recipient in this case. In fact, relating it to her would have averted the unpleasant disagreement altogether.

We do agree that it was possible to relate the information to Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها instead, but there are certain benefits in the first case which cannot be found in the second situation.

These are as follows:

Firstly, making a bequest of this nature to Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه indicates to the legitimacy of his khilāfah. It automatically hints that he is selected as the khalīfah, even if this is not expressed in clear terms. This hint is not the first of its kind. Actually, there are much more glaring indications contained in the Sunnah and some are even contained in the Glorious Qur'ān. This deals adequately with the nonsensical remark of ʿAmmār ʿAlī of "reveal it to a stranger who has no one else to verify this report". Therefore, the Prophet ﷺ knew that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه would be at the helm of affairs and he made the relevant bequests to him so that the khilāfah could run on the course of Nubuwwah.

Similarly, there could be a disadvantage in only divulging information to the recipient, if the recipient becomes a victim of the impulses of the nafs, and withholds such information. Whilst this cannot be fathomed about Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها on account of her being mahfūz or maʿsūm, it is also a fact that distinct and special circumstances do not dictate the application of sharʿī law. Therefore, if a matter in a court of law receives the testimony of only one person then despite that person being a saint of undisputed integrity, his testimony would have no implication on the case. In contrast to this, if two credible persons having less integrity than the first testify against his testimony, it would receive acceptance. This is because the benefit of general application of the law supersedes the rare instance of overlooking it in a specific instance. So, whilst the Shīʿah do claim that it was better to notify Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها about the situation, the general rule in this case is that the giver should be prohibited from giving, not the recipient prohibited from receiving.

In the first place it is actually incorrect to say that notifying her would have averted the unpleasant disagreement that followed since there was no disagreement and conflict at all. This will be highlighted soon, Allah willing. It is nothing more than the mischief of the Shīʿah, which they have publicised at length and it has no reality to it.

Secondly, when unpleasant incidents of this nature occur among the Ambiyā' of Allah they are not really referred to as arguments. Sometimes such situations are unavoidable and the incident of Nabī Mūsā عليه السلام and Nabī Hārūn عليه السلام is known to one and all.

Similarly, an unpleasant event resolved soon after its occurrence is hardly ever taken note of and even if there is premonition of its possibility, one does not go to lengths to avert it. Surely Sayyidunā Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq would have the dignity of apologising and refusing with politeness and Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها would not be a victim of misguidance and deviation. Therefore, the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم did not bother about these trivial matters and the narration of *Misbāḥ al-Sālikīn* proves that events turned out just as he would have expected. This narration—which will be recorded in due course—establishes that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه did excuse himself and Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها was satisfied by his clarification. This resolved the matter and restored the relationship between them harmoniously.

Thirdly, to say that that if the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم had told Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها there would have been no disagreement is assuming that the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم had knowledge of

the unseen. Many verses in the Qur’ān refute the notion that the Prophet ﷺ or for that matter anyone else has knowledge of the unseen. Consider the following verses:

قُل لَّا أَمْلِكُ لِنَفْسِيْ نَفْعًا وَلَا ضَرًّا إِلَّا مَا شَاءَ اللّٰهُ وَلَوْ كُنتُ أَعْلَمُ الْغَيْبَ لَاسْتَكْثَرْتُ مِنَ الْخَيْرِ وَمَا مَسَّنِيَ السُّوءُ إِنْ أَنَا إِلَّا نَذِيْرٌ وَبَشِيْرٌ لِّقَوْمٍ يُؤْمِنُوْنَ

Say, “I hold not for myself [the power of] benefit or harm, except what Allah has willed. And if I knew the unseen, I could have acquired much wealth, and no harm would have touched me. I am not except a warner and a bringer of good tidings to a people who believe.”[1]

And:

قُل لَّا يَعْلَمُ مَنْ فِيْ السَّمَاوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضِ الْغَيْبَ إِلَّا اللّٰهُ وَمَا يَشْعُرُوْنَ أَيَّانَ يُبْعَثُوْنَ

Say, “None in the heavens and earth knows the unseen except Allah, and they do not perceive when they will be resurrected.”[2]

The first verse discounts the notion that the Prophet ﷺ had knowledge of the unseen whilst the second verse refutes the idea that anyone—angels, Prophets, Jinn, or humans—has knowledge of the unseen.

These issues are logical and can be understood quite clearly. If one then fails to understand due to lack of intellect, what can one do?

Fourthly, since the benefit in telling both would be accomplished by telling either one, it was appropriate for Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه to be told as he would be the one tasked to discharge the affairs whilst Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها was only a possible recipient. Further, by telling Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه who was primarily charged with discharging all the affairs, the issue under review was resolved from its roots. On the other hand, the issue in relation to Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها was a mere branch and thus telling her would not be as effective when surveying the larger picture.

---

1 Sūrah al-Aʿrāf: 188.

2 Sūrah al-Naml: 65.

In any case, the fact that Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was to be the khalīfah outlines the importance of telling him. Judgment in cases would be brought to him and in the case of inheritance from the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, he would pass judgment accordingly no matter who presented the case to him from the heirs: Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا, or anyone else. By doing so a clear message would have been sent to the other heirs as well and, thus, they would not conduct any impermissible transaction within the inheritance. Aside from this, there was no element of impermissibility or sin in seeking the inheritance by the heirs whilst unaware that they had no right to it.

Furthermore, telling ʿAbbās and ʿĀ'ishah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا would have sufficed too since together they would have received just less than half of the inherence had it been distributed. Thus, if Fāṭimah or Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا were left unaware as well it would not have mattered. When the time came, the reality of the matter would have come to light. Leave all of this, let us assume that neither Abū Bakr, ʿĀ'ishah, or ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ, had any inkling of the matter and ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was the only one told (and as we have established he had knowledge of the matter) then too it was just as telling Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا because she was under his care and both their sons were yet children.

The Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ was fully aware that the issue of his inheritance would not be under consideration by only one or two people that it could be wrapped up in a clandestine manner. It was an impossibility that Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا would go seeking her inheritance and ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ would be unaware. For arguments sake, if we assume that Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا was allotted a share of the inheritance, ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ would be the one to go and take possession of it. Besides, ʿĀ'ishah and ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا weren't strangers to her. The former was akin to her mother and the latter like a grandfather. With such close familial ties, the issue of inheritance would have been openly discussed between them. In making ʿĀ'ishah and ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا aware, Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا and the other Noble Consorts of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ would also become aware of the reality of the matter. If not at the time of his passing, then definitely at the time of seeking. Such matters are not kept a secret that no one would know.

In conclusion, the manner in which the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ conducted this matter was in no way shrouded in secrecy. He had clarified it in front of ten/twelve and who knows how many more people. A point of note here is that amongst those that he made aware were ʿĀ'ishah, ʿAbbās, and ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ; two direct heirs and the other

an heir of an heir. Therefore, to claim that the divine law of prophetic inheritance was kept a secret from the heirs by the Prophet ﷺ is nonsensical.

An example of the Shīʿah keeping a divine law a secret

Shrouding a divine law with secrecy is what can be found amongst the false and fabricated narrations of the Shīʿah wherein they suppose Imām Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn kept the Imāmah of Imām Muḥammad al-Bāqir a secret from his son Zayd al-Shahīd. Secrecy that—according to Shīʿī dogma—results in disbelief. Consider the following narration which forms the basis of their belief:

من لم يعرف امام زمانه فقد مات ميتة جاهلية

Whoever does not know the Imām of his time has died a death of ignorance.

Thus, according to the Shīʿah, whoever does not know the Imām of his time—from the Twelve Imāms—dies a death just like those before the Prophethood of the Prophet ﷺ, a death of ignorance doomed to the fire. To put this into perspective, they propose that Imām Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn kept such a secret from Zayd al-Shahīd which is a fundamental belief of faith. This is keeping a secret of divine law! Not going to every heir and telling each one of them "We [the prophets] do not inherit, what we leave behind is sadaqah", is quite to the contrary!

Hereunder is the complete narration that outlines the above incident:

روى الكليني عن أبان قال: أخبرني الأحول أن زيد بن علي بعث إليه وهو مختف، قال: فأتيته فقال: يا أبا جعفر ما تقول إن طرقك طارق منا أتخرج معه. قال: فقلت له: إن كان أباك أو أخاك خرجت معه، فقال لي: فأنا أريد أن أخرج أجاهد هؤلاء القوم فاخرج معي، قال: قلت لا أفعل جعلت فداك، فقال: أترغب بنفسك عن نفسي؟ قال: قلت له: إنما هي نفس واحدة فإن كان لله في الأرض حجة فالمتخلف عنك والخارج معك سواء، قال: فقال: يا أبا جعفر كنت أجلس مع أبي في الخوان فيلقمني البضعة السمينة ويبرد لي اللقمة حتى تبرد شفقة علي ولم يشفق علي حر النار، إذ أخبرك ولم يخبرني به؟ فقلت له: خاف عليك أن لا تقبله فتدخل النار، وأخبرني أنا فإن قبلت نجوت وإن لم يبال أن أدخل النار،

> Al-Kulaynī narrated from Abān who said:
>
> Al-Aḥwal reported to me saying, "Zayd ibn ʿAlī sent for me while he was in hiding so I went to see him."
>
> He [Zayd] said to me, "O Abū Jaʿfar [al-Aḥwal] what will you say if a knocker from among us knocks on your door [asking for your support], would you come assist him?"
>
> I said to him, "If it is your father or your brother [al-Bāqir] I would set out with him."
>
> He [Zayd] said to me, "Verily I wish to rise up and fight these people so set out with me."
>
> I said, "No, I will not do so may I be made your ransom."
>
> He said to me, "Do you prefer your life over mine?"
>
> I said, "It is only one soul [that I have], if Allah does indeed have a *Ḥujjah* [proof; Imām] on the earth then the one who stays back and the one who joins you are both the same. [There is no benefit in joining you in jihād,]"
>
> He said to me, "O Abū Jaʿfar I used to sit with my father to share a plate with him so he would feed me the choicest piece of meat and cool for me a hot morsel out of love for me but he did not love me enough to save me from the hell-fire! How could it be that he informed you [of the Imāmah of Imām Bāqir] and did not inform me?"
>
> I said to him, "He feared for you that you would reject it and enter the fire, but he informed me [not caring either way], so if I accept, I am saved and he was not bothered that I enter the fire [if I reject]."

There are many aspects in this narration that lend support to the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamāʿah; however, this is not the place for it nor do we have the time to expand on it. Our focus in this narration is Imām Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn hiding the Imāmah of Imām Muḥammad al-Bāqir from his son Zayd al-Shahīd, whilst aware that knowing of his Imāmah was pillar of faith.

Consider the Fadak Estate; materialistic wealth, in relation to knowing the Imām of the time; a pillar of faith. Then consider Imām Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn keeping this from his son in relation to the Prophet ﷺ informing more than ten people regarding

the Fadak Estate with the intent of them passing it on. Further, understand the devastating and everlasting impact of Imām Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn not informing his son Zayd al-Shahīd of the Imāmah of Imām Muḥammad al-Bāqir and mirror it to the Prophet ﷺ not informing Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها or any other heir of the narration, 'We [the prophets] do not inherit, what we leave behind is ṣadaqah'. Even if—as assumed by the Shīʿah—the Prophet ﷺ only informed Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه of it, does it lead to devastating or lasting impact as with the case Zayd al-Shahīd?

Taking provision from the adage *recounting disbelief does not result in disbelief*, the result in the case of Zayd al-Shahīd not being aware of the Imām of his time would be him becoming a disbeliever and be subject to everlasting punishment.

For arguments sake, if we assume that the Prophet ﷺ did not inform anyone, neither Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه nor any other heir of the status of his inheritance and as a result the heirs distributed his estate—which was waqf—amongst themselves, then too there would be no blame on them in this world or the next. In any case, weigh the above two cases and compare the **secrecy** within them as well as the **resulting harm** and see which end of the scale falls.

After reading the above discussion, anyone having even a modicum of intelligence will conclude, that in no way can the Prophet ﷺ be accused of hiding a divine injunction whilst on the other hand—according to the Shīʿah—Imām Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn without a doubt kept a divine injunction a secret. Oh, how razor sharp is the intellect of Molvī ʿAmmār that he considers the former a gross injustice and secrecy of divine law whilst he glosses over the latter! I wonder who ever told him to insert his opinion in the matters of faith. Such nonsensical spewing of the ignorant aren't even worthy of answering; however, keeping quiet in front of such atrociousness burns one from inside and thus I have written much and am bound to continue to do so.

Did Abū Bakr return the Fadak Estate to Fāṭimah

Molvī ʿAmmār ʿAlī states:

> **Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها went to Abū Bakr more than once to seek her inheritance upon which he wrote out a document restoring the Fadak Estate to her. ʿUmar then appeared, snatched the document, and tore it to pieces.**

These statements will be analysed and the truth of the matter clearly explained. In reality his assertion is a lie told to cover other lies. For his allegations he references Sibṭ ibn al-Jawzī, al-Wāqidī, and Burhān al-Dīn al-Ḥalabī al-Shafiʿī and others. This is all a farce in order to beguile the Ahl al-Sunnah. The issue of Shīʿah narrations within the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah has already been discussed. There is no need to delve into it again, whoever wishes may refer to the section. However, then too, the references he has listed will be dealt with shortly.

The question of Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها going back to Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه, advising him, his writing of a document restoring it to her, and ʿUmar رضي الله عنه tearing it is a fabrication of ʿAmmār ʿAlī. Even the staunch Shīʿah have not gone to level he has gone to in his fabrications. Consider the following narration cited by Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī, a Shīʿī scholar of note who no doubt had far more hatred for Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه. Yet he too did not stupidly reproduce this incident of her going back to him and further ʿUmar رضي الله عنه tearing it. Rather he says:

لما وعظت فاطمة ابا بكر في فدك كتب لها كتابا وردها عليها

> When Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها advised Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه regarding the Fadak Estate, he wrote out a document restoring it to her.[1]

This much too, as asserted by al-Ḥillī, is an attack on the integrity of Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه insinuating he intended to withhold the Fadak Estate, returning it only after being offered counsel by Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها. It also attacks Abū Bakr's رضي الله عنه real viewpoint on the issue since if the narration, "We [the prophets] do not inherit, what we leave behind is ṣadaqah", was true, he would not have moved to restore it to her based on her counsel. It would be he, who would counsel Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها.

Also, if the incident of ʿUmar رضي الله عنه tearing the document was factual according to al-Ḥillī he would have certainly rebuked him to no end. If truth be told al-Ḥillī has alleviated any concern for the Ahl al-Sunnah in this matter. In any case Molvī ʿAmmār ʿAlī's objection has been dealt with by the narrations of the Shīʿah in this case. His seniors did not even dream of the fabrications he has thought up.

As far as al-Wāqidī is concerned, the scholars of ḥadīth consider him to be amongst those who fabricated narrations. Ibn al-Jawzī has penned a book specifically

1 *Minhāj al-Karāmah*.

dealing with fabricated narrations. Reproducing from this book only strengthens our point. If for arguments sake one accords any merit to the narration, then too it must be contextualised as to what purpose the author produced the narration for to fully understand its relevance. Consider the following verse:

إِنَّ اللَّهَ فَقِيرٌ وَنَحْنُ أَغْنِيَاءُ

Indeed, Allah is poor, while we are rich.[1]

Contextualising the verse would clarify it to be a statement of the Jews which Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ revealed to refute. The same answer would be given on behalf of Sibṭ ibn al-Jawzī for reproducing the narration in question.

The intent to deceive the masses of the Ahl al-Sunnah is quite evident from him referencing books that fall below the tier of acceptance. In order to create confusion and incite evil he has referenced these books illustrating them to be authentic. He also references books that were authored to expose such scams by reproducing fabricated narrations. Over and above this he fabricates narrations whilst referencing obscure books under the assumption that they would not be found or that no one would take on the headache of looking.

Molvī ʿAmmār brought the incident of Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا going to Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ on multiple occasions seeking her inheritance to the fore. This was probably to incite an outcry and claim a win of some sort.

Now consider some more of Molvī ʿAmmār's foolishness. He states:

> **Similarly, if ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and the rest of the Ṣaḥābah believed the fabricated narration of Abū Bakr regarding the inheritance of the Ambiyā' then why did ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ raise this issue once again with ʿUmar during his reign as the khalīfah? On that occasion, ʿUmar told them that they considered Abū Bakr to be a liar, a cheat, a deceiver and a transgressor and they harboured the very same thoughts about him, but he would do nothing more than what Abū Bakr had done about the matter. This narration is recorded in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Muslim*.**
>
> **The *Musnad* of Aḥmad records that this matter was raised once again with ʿUthmān during his reign. Therefore, if Abū Bakr was truthful, they would**

1 Sūrah Āl-ʿImrān: 181.

never have claimed Fadak from him. This establishes that Abū Bakr forged the narration and he usurped Fadak from Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها due to his hatred for the Ahl al-Bayt. Similarly, ʿUmar highlighted to ʿAlī رضي الله عنه and Abbās رضي الله عنه that they considered Abū Bakr to be a fraud and a liar and they have the same sentiments for him. So, when ʿAlī رضي الله عنه considers them to be liars and cheats, then we will do the same. This is the true narrative regarding the Fadak Estate.

The Narration of Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim

If one studies the narration of *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, one will come to the realization that the assertion Molvī ʿAmmār makes is built upon the need to deceive and a desire to misguide the masses. The meeting which he refers to, was convened to discuss the management of the lands, not its ownership. The narration he cited, the narration of Mālik ibn Aws, and other narrations of *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* make this quite clear. He did not grasp this either due to his dim-wittedness or as a result of blindly accepting and regurgitating the statements of his predecessors.

Citing these narrations would prove time-consuming as they require much explanation, especially the lengthy narration of Mālik ibn Aws and time is of the essence. I will, however, provide a brief explanation in light of one of the narrations, to quell any nagging doubts. The narration of ʿĀ'ishah رضي الله عنها which appears a little after the narration cited, highlights the fact that ʿUmar رضي الله عنه had given over management of those endowments to ʿAlī and ʿAbbās رضي الله عنهما which were in the vicinity of Madinah and its surrounds. As for the Fadak and Khaybar Estates, he had kept those under his own supervision. In the narration cited by Molvī ʿAmmār it seems as though ʿUmar رضي الله عنه is seeking an undertaking on an oath from ʿAlī and ʿAbbās رضي الله عنهما to do just as the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم did. However, the narration of ʿĀ'ishah رضي الله عنها explains that ʿAlī رضي الله عنه had taken over the managerial duties of ʿAbbās رضي الله عنه. Hereunder is the wording of the narration:

فأما صدقته بالمدينة، فدفعها عمر إلى علي، وعباس، فغلبه عليها علي

So far as the charitable endowments at Madīnah were concerned, ʿUmar handed them over to ʿAlī and ʿAbbās, but ʿAlī got the better of him (and kept the property under his exclusive management).[1]

1 *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, Ḥadīth: 1759.

Since ʿAlī رضي الله عنه had taken over the exclusive management of the endowment which was initially handed over to both him and ʿAbbās رضي الله عنه, they had a falling out. Both of them then approached ʿUmar رضي الله عنه themselves to resolve the matter. They had also sent ʿUthmān, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn ʿAwf, Zubayr ibn al-ʿAwwām, and Saʿd ibn Abī Waqqāṣ رضي الله عنهم before their arrival in order to facilitate a resolution. Molvī ʿAmmār has taken this and ran with it trying to prove a claim of inheritance from Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه by them since they had an exchange of words with him at this time.

When these six individuals came to ʿUmar رضي الله عنه and raised this matter, he asked them under oath if they knew that the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم had said:

لا نورث ما تركنا صدقة

We [the prophets] do not inherit, what we leave behind is ṣadaqah.

They all responded in the affirmative that the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم had indeed said so. After much discussion ʿUmar رضي الله عنه said:

> ثم جئتني أنت وهذا وأنتما جميع وأمركما واحد، فقلتما: ادفعها إلينا، فقلت: إن شئتم دفعتها إليكما على أن عليكما عهد الله أن تعملا فيها بالذي كان يعمل رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم، فأخذتماها بذلك، قال: أكذلك؟ قالا: نعم، قال: ثم جئتماني لأقضي بينكما، ولا والله لا أقضي بينكما بغير ذلك حتى تقوم الساعة، فإن عجزتما عنها فرداها إلي،
>
> Then you as well as he came to me. Both of you have come and your purpose is identical.
>
> You said, "Entrust the property to us."
>
> I said, "If you wish that I should entrust it to you, it will be on the condition that both of you will undertake to abide by a pledge made with Allah that you will use it in the same way as the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم used it."
>
> So, both of you got it.
>
> ʿUmar said, "Wasn't it like this?"
>
> They said, "Yes."
>
> ʿUmar said, "Then you have (again) come to me with the request that I should adjudge between you. No, by Allah. I will not give any other judgment

> except this until the Last Hour. If you are unable to hold the property on this condition, return it to me."[1]

Let us assume for a moment that ʿAlī and ʿAbbās رضي الله عنهما came to ʿUmar رضي الله عنه seeking inheritance and ʿUmar رضي الله عنه further apportioned for them the endowments as inheritance. Then why would ʿAlī رضي الله عنه despite being 'infallible' [according to the Shīʿah] usurp the share of ʿAbbās رضي الله عنه? Do the Shīʿah believe ʿAlī رضي الله عنه to be so lowly that whatever came his way he wolfed down? Or do the Shīʿah perhaps believe infallibility gives one the licence to oppress with impunity.

ʿAlī undertaking sole management proves the endowments ineligible for inheritance

Looking at this incident through the eye glass of impartiality and considering the fact that ʿAlī رضي الله عنه took over the managerial duties of ʿAbbās رضي الله عنه to be the sole administrator of the endowments is clear evidence that the lands did not form part of any estate suitable for inheritance. The estate was in fact an endowment. This is notwithstanding one administrator taking over the administration of another, a resolution of prudence rather than oppression, based upon the vision of growth of the endowment in order to fulfill its original purpose; its proceeds a boon to the poor. This difference in vision for the endowment led to the conflict between ʿAlī and ʿAbbās رضي الله عنهما.

Having understood the above, it cannot be any clearer that the lands were under the administration of ʿAlī and ʿAbbās رضي الله عنهم and not under their ownership. Thus, their fallout was based upon the administration which they took to ʿUmar رضي الله عنه to resolve. The resolution offered by ʿUmar رضي الله عنه was simple; continue administrating as the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم had done. This was after them and the others having attested to it not being part of any inheritance. Reflect for a moment. What was the need for them to be given a set of instructions regarding the lands if they had ownership of it through the agency of inheritance? If one owns a land, he may do so as he pleases. The reality of the matter is that since they did not have ownership, rather only administration, they were bound by the rules of the endowment.

Further, ʿUmar رضي الله عنه stating he would not pass any other judgment till the Day of Judgment reinforces the notion that he had handed over the endowments to ʿAlī and

---

1 *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, Ḥadīth: 1757.

ʿAbbās رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا to administer and not in ownership. If they had actually inherited the land, then the resolution to their conflict would have been to allocate to them their portion of land, an uncomplicated task. In reality his reasoning for not allocating specific pieces of land to administer was to avoid future generational claims of ownership to the lands. With the passing of time people may come to think of the lands to be the inheritance of Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا on whose behalf ʿAlī رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ spoke and of ʿAbbās رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ, thus claiming ownership of lands that were in fact not theirs.

ʿAlī and ʿAbbās رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا attest to the honesty of Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ

Upon being asked on oath, both ʿAlī and ʿAbbās رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا attested to the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ saying:

لا نورث ما تركنا صدقة

We [the prophets] do not inherit, what we leave behind is sadaqah.

Then based on what logic could they have sought inheritance from the Prophetic Estate? Only the Shīʿah can come up with such convoluted mental gymnastics to reach such a conclusion.

Molvī ʿAmmār states, as discussed previously, that Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ had written a document restoring Khaybar to Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا which ʿUmar رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ tore to pieces. If, for a moment, we consider this to be true then why would ʿAlī and ʿAbbās رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا go to ʿUmar رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ in his reign seeking inheritance that he had already denied so strongly when he wasn't in the seat of khilāfah? It would be an obtuse assumption to think them so foolish to re-visit a discussion at time when they would have been at a significant disadvantage. It is therefore quite evident that their approaching him from the very first instance was in the capacity of administering the endowments and not to seek it as inheritance. The wording of the narration lends strength to this as well. They said:

ادفعها إلينا

Entrust the property to us.

Which shows that from the beginning they sought to administer it, not own it.

Still, the question of what benefit it was to them to administer the endowment remains. After much thought, the following comes to mind and Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ

knows best. The relatives of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم held a preemptive share in the revenue generated from the prophetic endowments, and the excess going to the other categories of recipients, especially in endowments of fay'. An indication to this is made by Allah سبحانه وتعالى in mentioning them first amongst the recipients and the aḥādīth also suggest the same.

However, the khalīfah was preoccupied in more pressing matters of the state and was not solely focused on the administration of the endowments. Further, those with a greater interest in a matter would give it its due right. Keeping the above in mind ʿAlī and ʿAbbās رضي الله عنهما petitioned to administer the endowment and ʿUmar رضي الله عنه acceded. ʿUmar رضي الله عنه also understood that ʿAlī and ʿAbbās رضي الله عنهما would have a better idea of who was needy amongst the Banū Hāshim and who was not and, thus, they were better suited to administer the endowment and its revenue. He also knew that there was no fear of someone thinking of this to be a transaction of ownership as the narration, "We [the prophets] do not inherit, what we leave behind is ṣadaqah", was well known and widely circulated. He did, however, refrain from giving them specific shares within the endowment to administer, fearing future generational claims of ownership via the inheritance of Fāṭimah and ʿAbbās رضي الله عنهما.

Yes, Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه refused handing over the administration of the endowments since the incident of Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها having asked for her inheritance was fresh in the minds of people. The narration, "We [the prophets] do not inherit, what we leave behind is ṣadaqah", was not well known and had he given over its administration it would have been construed as him giving over the prophetic endowments as inheritance.

The superlatives cheat, deceiver and, transgressor was hyperbole—a figure of speech

ʿUmar رضي الله عنه refuted suppositions and rejected misunderstandings that that had trickled down to the masses. By using hyperbole, he made clear that since ʿAlī and ʿAbbās رضي الله عنه accepted the narration:

لا نورث ما تركنا صدقة

We [the prophets] do not inherit, what we leave behind is ṣadaqah

They did not actually believe Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه to be a cheat, deceiver, and a transgressor. ʿUmar رضي الله عنه further stated the reality of the matter which they all agreed on by saying:

والله يعلم إنه لصادق بار راشد تابع للحق

And Allah knows that he was true, virtuous, well-guided, and a follower of truth.

Such figures of speech are quite common at times of misunderstandings between friends and family as well. If on the other hand ʿAmmār ʿAlī wants to misconstrue this and insinuate something else, then this is down to him singing untruths or due to him being innately dense.

Hyperbole and exaggeration are found even in Qur'ānic verses and the aḥādīth. Take for example the following verse:

حَتَّىٰ إِذَا اسْتَيْأَسَ الرُّسُلُ وَظَنُّوْا أَنَّهُمْ قَدْ كُذِبُوْا جَاءَهُمْ نَصْرُنَا فَنُجِّيَ مَنْ نَّشَاءُ وَلَا يُرَدُّ بَأْسُنَا عَنِ الْقَوْمِ الْمُجْرِمِيْنَ

[They continued] until, when the Messengers despaired and were certain that they had been denied, there came to them Our victory, and whoever We willed was saved. And Our punishment cannot be repelled from the people who are criminals.[1]

From the apparent of this verse, it seems as though the Prophets despaired in the promises of Allah سبحانه وتعالى and came to think of the promises of His help to be false. However, the believers are acutely aware that such thoughts of despondency and dejection is far removed from the status of the Prophets. In the verses preceding this Allah سبحانه وتعالى says:

إِنَّهُ لَا يَيْأَسُ مِنْ رَّوْحِ اللّٰهِ إِلَّا الْقَوْمُ الْكَافِرُوْنَ

Indeed, no one despairs of relief from Allah except the disbelieving people.[2]

Then how can any believer think the Prophets would despair?

1 Sūrah Yūsuf: 110.

2 Sūrah Yūsuf: 87.

If we were to follow the logic of ʿAmmār ʿAlī in asserting Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهُ to be a cheat etc., then considering Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ is more truthful than ʿUmar رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهُ one would have to assert under the ruling of the above verse that the Prophets, due to their despondency, were in fact disbelievers. [May Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ save us from such folly.]

Generally, the word *Ẓann* is used in the Qur'ān to state false assertions that have entered the heart and have become belief. Consequently, the false assertion of the disbelievers that they will not be resurrected and that no one has the ultimate power to take life is referred to in Sūrah al-Jāthiyah using the same word:

إِنْ هُمْ إِلَّا يَظُنُّوْنَ

They are only assuming.[1]

The disbelievers had no doubt in this belief of theirs; however, due to the assertion being false, Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ referred to it using the word *Ẓann*. Similar is the use in the verse:

إِنَّهُ ظَنَّ أَنْ لَّنْ يَحُوْرَ

Indeed, he had thought he would never return [to Allah].[2]

If we apply this rule of use to the principle verse under discussion, *were certain that they had been denied*, then ʿAmmār ʿAlī would have to concede that the Prophets belief in the help of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ was false.

On the other hand, if we take the colloquial meaning of the word *Ẓann*, which is used to denote either an overpowering thought or a doubt, then it would mean the Prophets had no conviction in the promises of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ, rendering them disbelievers and anyone following them misguided and ruined. [May Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ save us from such folly].

Another possible interpretation is that the *Ẓann* of Prophets was in relation to the delay of assistance and not in relation to the truth of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ. If this is taken to be the case, it would reveal uncertainty on their part in the revelation. An

1 Sūrah al-Jāthiyah: 24.

2 Sūrah al-Inshiqāq: 14.

allegation that neither we nor the Shīʿah would be willing to accept, since if they don't have conviction in the revelation then who would?

The only remaining explanation is that due to natural human instinct, a fear passed through the heart—which takes nothing away from their concrete faith—and was expressed with the word *Ẓann*—a figure of expression by way of hyperbole. Then this is exactly what we have been saying with regards to the statement of ʿUmar رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ.

In conclusion, the verse does not establish despair in Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ on the part of the Prophets عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ nor does it insinuate doubt in the revelation they received. It was a figure of expression by way of hyperbole wherein lay advice to the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ to not fall into such thoughts or for some other reason. There are many other verses of this nature as well, which if taken out of context and without understanding its purport may be blasphemous.

Now contextualise the statement of ʿUmar رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ in a similar manner. If due to natural human instinct, ʿAlī and ʿAbbās رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا felt slighted and their sentiments were exaggerated by ʿUmar رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ in order for them to realise the shallow nature of their negative sentiment, whilst affirming the positive attitude that always had, then there remains no issue. He used a method of expression found in the Qur'ān.

Another point to note is that since it was ʿUmar رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ who made these statements, he could have been mistaken. Perhaps ʿAlī and ʿAbbās رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا did not feel slighted in the least.

Double standards

It is sad to see that without grasping the context, ʿAmmār ʿAlī is quick to point a nasty finger at Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ through an understated insinuation that could perhaps be attributed to ʿAlī رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ. Whereas on the other hand, when ʿAlī رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ himself emphasises the virtue of Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ by taking oaths, he turns a blind eye.

The disbelief and double standards of the Shīʿah burns through here, the smoke of their deceit visible for all to see. When it comes to vilifying Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ then even ʿUmar رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ is a worthy reference. And when it comes to praising him, then ʿAlī رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ too is pushed aside. In the very same narration that ʿAmmār ʿAlī references, ʿAbbās رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ uses the very same superlatives to describe ʿAlī رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ that ʿUmar رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ

used[1]. Why doesn't he reproduce that portion of the narration as well? The intent is clear; all he wants is to vilify Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه.

The manner in which the Shīʿah conduct themselves is just like that of the Banī Isrā'īl. They saw thousands of miracles, but they refused to reform and yet they saw one trick of Sāmirī and they believed in him.

After this explanation ʿAmmār ʿAlī might have come to realise the foolishness of his idiotic objection. And if due to his stupidity, he fails to come to this realisation and persists that ʿUmar's رضي الله عنه statement is to be understood literally, at its face value, then we call on him to consider the following.

The incident of Mūsā عليه السلام returning to find the people worshiping the calf is famous. His could not see the law of Allah سبحانه وتعالى being broken and the sentiment of his īmān erupted. He saw the people worshiping the calf and he thought that perhaps Hārūn عليه السلام was complicit or that he did not try to prevent them. As a result of this misgiving he grabbed Hārūn عليه السلام by the hair of his head and beard. This act of Mūsā عليه السلام was not an emotional outburst, it was a result of a thought pattern which came to one of two suppositions; Hārūn عليه السلام being complicit or him not preventing the Banī Isrā'īl from falling into calf worship.

As we know, the conclusion Mūsā عليه السلام came to was incorrect—a misunderstanding. Hārūn عليه السلام was neither complicit nor did he shirk in his responsibility of preventing the people from calf worship. Nevertheless, based on his misunderstanding he reacted in the manner he did.

Now, reflect: If an infallible can have such misgivings regarding another infallible that it leads to a physical altercation, then what is the issue if ʿAlī رضي الله عنه had a suspicion regarding Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه?

The Ahl al-Sunnah have no issue with such a possibility as they do not believe Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه to be infallible, nor do they believe ʿAlī رضي الله عنه to be infallible.

Further, this is only valid if what ʿUmar رضي الله عنه said was indeed the sentiment within the heart of ʿAlī رضي الله عنه, which in reality was the conjecture of ʿUmar رضي الله عنه at best, and that too an expression of conjecture by way of hyperbole!

---

1 *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, Ḥadīth: 1757

فقال عباس: يا أمير المؤمنين، اقض بيني وبين هذا الكاذب الآثم الغادر الخائن

Lay this conjecture on one side of the weighing scale and in the other place the unequivocal acceptance of the narration:

لا نورث ما تركنا صدقة

We [the prophets] do not inherit, what we leave behind is ṣadaqah.

By ʿAlī رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ together with his over-reaching praise of Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ and decide. A foregone conclusion no doubt; ʿAlī رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ was a devotee of Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ.

If ʿAmmār ʿAlī still persists, then by way of his logic he should clearly say that Hārūn عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ was involved in polytheism and sin by being implicit in the worship of the calf or by not preventing anyone from doing so. And since the Shīʿah believe that an infallible is infallible from misunderstandings too, they should slam Mūsā عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ as well, since his act was based on a misunderstanding.

Intricate questions and answers—a dilemma

There is always a dilemma when addressing intricate questions with perhaps even more intricate answers. I am apprehensive that one may misunderstand the actual meaning of the content and—even unwittingly—lead themselves astray. However, the Qur'ān and Ḥadīth can also be subject to erroneous interpretation by which one may be led astray. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ says:

يُضِلُّ بِهِ كَثِيْرًا وَيَهْدِي بِهِ كَثِيْرًا وَمَا يُضِلُّ بِهِ إِلَّا الْفَاسِقِيْنَ

He misleads many thereby and guides many thereby. And He misleads not except the defiantly disobedient.[1]

Therefore, I have decided it prudent and necessary to pen down some further thoughts to expound on two objections that could be brought forth.

Our discussion will revolve around a portion the narration of Malik ibn Aws as recorded in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*. We have already dealt with some parts of this narration in answering the statements made by ʿAmmār ʿAlī. Our object of discussion is that part of the narration wherein ʿUmar رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ said to ʿAlī and ʿAbbās رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا:

1 Sūrah Baqarah: 26.

فلما توفي رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم، قال أبو بكر أنا ولي رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم، فجئتما تطلب ميراثك من ابن أخيك، ويطلب هذا ميراث امرأته من أبيها فقال أبو بكر قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ما نورث ما تركناه صدقة فرأيتماه كاذبا آثما غادرا خائنا

When the Messenger of Allah ﷺ passed away, Abū Bakr said, "I am the successor of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ."

Both of you came, you (referring to ʿAbbās) seeking your inheritance from your nephew, and him (referring to ʿAlī) seeking inheritance on behalf of his wife from her father.

Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه said, "The Messenger of Allah ﷺ had said, 'We [the prophets] do not inherit, what we leave behind is ṣadaqah.' So, both of you thought him to be a liar, sinful, treacherous and dishonest."[1]

This raises two objections against the stance of the Ahl al-Sunnah.

Two Objections

1. The first objection is that the Ahl al-Sunnah consider ʿAlī and ʿAbbās رضي الله عنهما to be narrators of the ḥadīth:

   لا نورث ما تركنا صدقة

   We [the prophets] do not inherit, what we leave behind is ṣadaqah.

   However, from here it seems as though they had no prior knowledge of the narration. If they were aware of it, why would they seek inheritance? The Ahl al-Sunnah cannot fathom ʿAlī and ʿAbbās رضي الله عنهما would seek inheritance whilst having heard this narration from the Prophet ﷺ.

2. The second objection is the wording *your inheritance and inheritance on behalf of his wife*, and in reply to which Abū Bakr narrated the ḥadīth, "We [the prophets] do not inherit, what we leave behind is ṣadaqah.". This clearly shows that they came seeking 'inheritance'. And since they were not aware of the narration, 'We [the prophets] do not inherit, what we leave behind is ṣadaqah' Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه informed them of it. Upon which they [supposedly]

1 *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, Ḥadīth: 1757.

thought him a liar, sinful, treacherous, and dishonest for withholding their inheritance. This is because withholding someone's inheritance is cheating them of it.

If the narration showed that they came seeking to administer the estates from Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه as they had sought from ʿUmar رضي الله عنه, there would be no issue since preventing one from administering is no oppression. There is no right to administer. The khalīfah has a choice in the matter.

The second objection is dealt with first, followed by an answer to the first objection.

Answering the second objection

Consider the answers to these objections carefully.

The first answer

The literal (*Ḥaqīqī*) meaning of *Mīrath* is 'to stand in place of'. However, in the usage of the jurists it has come to mean 'inheritance'. As such there is nothing wrong in taking the meaning of the word in these exchanges in its original literal usage. If we do so, then there remains no objection. It would mean that they came to Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه seeking to administer the estate and not to inherit it.

The second answer

If we do not take the word in its *Ḥaqīqī* meaning, then it can also be in its metaphorical (*Majāz Mutaʿāraf*[1]) meaning. The Qur'ān has used this metaphorical meaning extensively. Consider the following verses:

إِنَّ الْأَرْضَ لِلّٰهِ يُوْرِثُهَا مَنْ يَشَاءُ مِنْ عِبَادِهِ وَالْعَاقِبَةُ لِلْمُتَّقِيْنَ

Indeed, the earth belongs to Allah. He causes to inherit it whom He wills of His servants. And the [best] outcome is for the righteous.[2]

وَ اَوْرَثْنَا الْقَوْمَ الَّذِيْنَ كَانُوْا يُسْتَضْعَفُوْنَ مَشَارِقَ الْاَرْضِ وَ مَغَارِبَهَا الَّتِيْ بٰرَكْنَا فِيْهَا

1 A metaphorical meaning which has become the commonly understood connotation of the word.

2 Sūrah al-Aʿrāf: 128.

And We caused the people who had been oppressed to inherit the eastern regions of the land and the western ones, which We had blessed.[1]

The explanation of the metaphorical usage within these two verses has already passed under the chapter: Inheritance also refers to successor.

Consider a third verse as well:

إِنَّا نَحْنُ نَرِثُ الْأَرْضَ وَمَنْ عَلَيْهَا وَإِلَيْنَا يُرْجَعُوْنَ

Indeed, it is We who will inherit the earth and whoever is on it, and to Us they will be returned.[2]

It is clear that this verse is not in the meaning of 'inheritance', it is in the meaning of 'to be in place of' which is the basic understanding of administering or managing. The manager is in the place of the one making the endowment.

According to this usage, in our case of *your inheritance and inheritance on behalf of his wife* ʿUmar رضي الله عنه is stating to ʿAlī and ʿAbbās رضي الله عنهما that they wanted to administer the Prophet's صلى الله عليه وسلم estate.

The above two answers are considering the word Mīrath to not be in its colloquial usage.

The third answer

If for the sake of the Shīʿah we take the meaning of *mīrāth* in its colloquial usage and deem all other meanings far-fetched, then too it would continue giving the same meaning that we have already established. It is possible that ʿUmar رضي الله عنه referred to 'administering' as 'inheritance' by way of comparison (*tashbīh*) to the close family relations. The common feature of which is quite evident.

Nonetheless, if one takes a meaning besides the original stipulated meaning and then finds any external factor that influences such usage, taking it back to its original stipulated meaning, then the word will accept such influence. In our study, the external influence is blindingly evident as just a few lines before ʿAlī and ʿAbbās رضي الله عنهما affirmed that the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم did in fact say:

1 Sūrah al-Aʿrāf: 137.

2 Sūrah Maryam: 40.

لا نورث ما تركنا صدقة

We [the prophets] do not inherit, what we leave behind is ṣadaqah.

An objection to the three answers

Question: We accept that all three answers have their merit; however, one question remains: Since ʿAlī and ʿAbbās رضي الله عنهما were in fact seeking to administer the estate and not inherit it, why did Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه reply to their request with the narration:

لا نورث ما تركنا صدقة

We [the prophets] do not inherit, what we leave behind is ṣadaqah.

Since there is no doubt that *inherit* in this narration is in its colloquial meaning, what relation does it have with administering?

Answer: There are two types of answers, *Muṭābiqī*[1] and *Iltizāmī*[2]. In this instance the answer was given in the form of the latter to emphasise the importance of them not taking even the administration of the estate at that time as this could be misconstrued by others and by future generations as inheritance given. The consequence of this would be future generational claims of inheritance in an endowment.

Answering the first objection

If we assume, as the Shīʿah do, that ʿAlī and ʿAbbās رضي الله عنهما had come to seek inheritance, then why did they do so after having heard the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم say, "We [the prophets] do not inherit, what we leave behind is ṣadaqah"?

The reason for this is simple. They had forgotten the narration and when Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه narrated it they remembered. Forgetting something doesn't put a blight on ʿAlī's رضي الله عنه integrity. Even the great Prophets forgot. Consider the following examples.

---

1 A corresponding answer in harmony with the question posed.

2 Presenting an answer as the necessary consequence of a claim in order to refute or affirm the claim itself.

- Nabī Ādam عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ

Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ says regarding Ādam عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ:

وَلَقَدْ عَهِدْنَا إِلَىٰ آدَمَ مِن قَبْلُ فَنَسِيَ وَلَمْ نَجِدْ لَهُ عَزْمًا

And We had already taken a promise from Ādam before, but he forgot; and We found not in him determination.[1]

If Ādam عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ, being the Prophet of Allah, can forget an emphasised command of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ, then ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ in comparison is only an Imām. A child of Ādam who had, as all children of Ādam have, inherited his innate forgetfulness. The fact they forgot a general statement of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ is not to their detriment in the least.

- Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ

When Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ travelled under the tutelage of Khiḍr عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ the latter impressed upon Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ not to question his actions until he himself explains. This incident has been mentioned at length in Sūrah Kahf. Nevertheless, when Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ saw things that did not make sense to him, he forgot that he had given his word to Khiḍr عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ to not question him. When he saw Khiḍr damaging the vessel of those who had taken them aboard he said:

أَخَرَقْتَهَا لِتُغْرِقَ أَهْلَهَا لَقَدْ جِئْتَ شَيْئًا إِمْرًا

Have you torn it open to drown its people? You have certainly done a grave thing.[2]

He implored Khiḍr of the good they had done to them and the fact that he is repaying them by damaging their vessel! Khiḍr عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ said to him:

أَلَمْ أَقُلْ إِنَّكَ لَن تَسْتَطِيعَ مَعِيَ صَبْرًا

Did I not say that with me you would never be able to have patience?[3]

1 Sūrah Ṭāhā: 115.

2 Sūrah Kahf: 71.

3 Sūrah Kahf: 72.

Mūsā عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ then presented his excuse stating:

قَالَ لَا تُؤَاخِذْنِيْ بِمَا نَسِيْتُ وَلَا تُرْهِقْنِيْ مِنْ أَمْرِيْ عُسْرًا

*Do not blame me for what **I forgot** and do not cover me in my matter with difficulty.*[1]

In essence, even though it was impressed upon him, he forgot so quickly. So then for ʿAlī رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ to forget a general statement after a lengthy period of is quite understandable and not at all implausible.

- The Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ

If the Shīʿah aren't happy with the examples of Adam عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ and Mūsā عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ, then consider the example of the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ says addressing the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ:

وَاذْكُرْ رَّبَّكَ إِذَا نَسِيْتَ

And remember your Lord when you forget.[2]

This clearly shows the possibility of forgetting on the part of the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. In fact, the reason for the revelation of this verse was that the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ had promised to say something to the disbelievers the following day and forgot to say *In Shā Allāh* (if Allah wills). Upon this Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ advised the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ in this manner.

Furthermore, the authentic Shīʿah books such as *al-Kāfī* of al-Kulaynī and *Tahdhīb* of Abū Jaʿfar al-Ṭūsī mention, by way of chains of narrators considered authentic, that the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ made a mistake in ṣalāh, reading two instead of four. Well, if the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ could make a mistake in a matter related to Dīn, then ʿAlī رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ is but of his Ummah.

Thus, it is plainly obvious that ʿAlī and ʿAbbās رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا having heard the narration themselves, forgot; not remembering it at the time. The reason for this is also evident. Since in every single other case across the world inheritance is distributed to the heirs, it is quite plausible if the heirs of the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ forgot and sought their inheritance.

1 Sūrah Kahf: 73.

2 Sūrah Kahf: 24.

However, when Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه reminded them, they remembered. This is why when ʿUmar رضي الله عنه made them both administrators of the estate, ʿAlī رضي الله عنه took over the managerial duties of ʿAbbās رضي الله عنه. If they really thought it to be inheritance, then ʿAlī رضي الله عنه would have foregone his right for the right of ʿAbbās رضي الله عنه as the latter was an actual heir whilst ʿAlī رضي الله عنه was not; he was a representative of Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها. Over and above this, if he truly considered it to be inheritance, he would have distributed it amongst the heirs during his khilāfah. He would have given the noble consorts of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم their shares, the children of ʿAbbās رضي الله عنه their share and so on. He did not distribute any of it though. He administered it as it always had been administered. This has already been established through sources of both the Ahl al-Sunnah and Shīʿah. There remains no other explanation besides this: When Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه reminded them, they remembered and they further affirmed this in the presence of ʿUmar رضي الله عنه.

Why then the friction between them and Abū Bakr?

The final part of this puzzle is that why did ʿUmar رضي الله عنه attribute resentment on their part for Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه since there was no reason for it? The reason for this assumption of ʿUmar رضي الله عنه was that although they knew they weren't heirs to the endowments, they still did believe that they had the right to administer the endowments. However, as we know Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه retained administration of the endowment which led to this friction. ʿUmar رضي الله عنه came to know of this or deduced that they felt this way regarding this issue and so made the statement that he did. They on the other hand, opted to not respond knowing well the impartiality and reasoning of Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه. And Allah سبحانه وتعالى knows best the truth of the matter.

This concludes the section discussing the ḥadīth of *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* and exploring all its angles. Anyone of sound mind who studies it, even if gone astray through foul company, will find his way to the straight path. And if not then we say:

مَنْ يُضْلِلِ اللّٰهُ فَلَا هَادِيَ لَهُ وَيَذَرُهُمْ فِيْ طُغْيَانِهِمْ يَعْمَهُوْنَ

Whoever Allah sends astray, there is no guide for him. And He leaves them in their transgression, wandering blindly.[1]

1 Sūrah al-Aʿrāf: 186.

There still remains the last bit of senselessness of ʿAmmār ʿAlī that needs to be addressed. We will respond in a manner that won't only break the teeth of ʿAmmār ʿAlī and his elders but will completely stitch their mouths shut.

Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها refused to speak to Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه and made a bequest that Abū Bakr and ʿUmar رضي الله عنهما not attend her funeral

Molvī ʿAmmār ʿAlī states:

> ***Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* adds that when Abū Bakr refused to hand over Fadak then Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها became angry and refused to speak to him ever again. Similarly, Ṣaḥīḥ al-Muslim records that when she was leaving this world, Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها made a bequest that Abū Bakr and ʿUmar should not attend her funeral ceremony**

This is the last portion of the letter and the last of the tricks in his bag. Those with some understanding will clearly realize that after all that has been written, especially the indication of the verse, *Yūsīkum Allāh* (Allah instructs you all), and the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم being excluded from its purport—as well as the verse, *Mā Afā' Allāh* (what Allah restored) which establishes Fadak and other estates to be endowments—there could be absolutely no reproach against Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه for not handing over Fadak to Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها.

Really though this should be ammunition for the Shīʿah, Khawārij, and Nawāṣib to vilify Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها who requested inheritance from an endowment and further cut of relations with Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه. More so the Shīʿah, who consider her infallible. The truth, however, can never be challenged.

The Ahl al-Sunnah though, lay their cards bare. Just as they consider Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه beyond reproach in this matter, so too do they consider Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها beyond reproach. Neither of their actions render them blame worthy, nor does it affect the integrity of their faith.

The entire ummah is dependent on the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم in understanding the Qur'ān

Pay attention now. Fāṭimah al-Zahrā رضي الله عنها is not only the Queen of all women. She is in fact the leader of the pious. Her virtues are immense. True love for her is the way to eternal salvation and true faith in her raises one's stages. However,

she is still an individual of the Ummah, she was not a Prophet. Like the rest of the Ummah, she was also in need of Prophetic explanation to understand the purport of the Qur'ān. Merely understanding the language and having a deep intellect does not allow one to understand the intricacies of the Qur'ān. The only way to understand the correct meaning of the Qur'ānic verses is through the explanation of the receiver of revelation, the seal of the Prophets, the Prophet ﷺ. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ says:

كَمَا أَرْسَلْنَا فِيكُمْ رَسُولًا مِّنكُمْ يَتْلُوْ عَلَيْكُمْ أَيَاتِنَا وَيُزَكِّيْكُمْ وَيُعَلِّمُكُمُ الْكِتَابَ وَالْحِكْمَةَ

Just as We have sent among you a Messenger from yourselves reciting to you Our verses and purifying you and teaching you the Book and wisdom.[1]

Contemplate over this verse. The first portion of the verse, i.e. *reciting to you Our verses*, represents the Prophet ﷺ teaching the manner of recitation. The second portion of the verse, i.e. *and purifying you*, represents the Prophet ﷺ rectifying and purifying the believers—an indication to reforming the internal self from maladies of the heart. The next part of the verse is *and teaching you the Book and wisdom*. Even if we do not consider the colloquial usage of *Taʿlīm* being for the knowledge of meaning, the fact that it comes after *reciting to you Our verses* clearly demonstrate that this portion of the verse deals with the meaning of the Qur'ān.

Further analysis of the verse shows that the pronoun in *and teaching you* applies to the entire Ummah and to a greater degree those Muslims who had the blessed opportunity of his Companionship. The word *Minkum (from yourselves)* is reminiscent of this. These points illustrate that everyone is dependent on the Prophet ﷺ in understanding the meaning of the Qur'ān. Another notable point here is that true understanding of the meanings of the Qur'ān can only be achieved by one who has purified his inner self. It is for this reason that *and teaching you the Book* came after *and purifying you*. There are many other verses of the Qur'ān that support this as the people of knowledge will be aware.

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 151.

The Prophet ﷺ is excluded from the verse, And mankind have not been given of knowledge except a little

Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ addressing all of mankind besides the Prophet ﷺ says:

وَمَا أُوتِيتُم مِّنَ الْعِلْمِ إِلَّا قَلِيلًا

And mankind have not been given of knowledge except a little.[1]

The opening portion of this verse is clear in that the Prophet ﷺ has been instructed to pass on this verse to the Ummah as a Messenger and is not included in its address:

وَيَسْأَلُونَكَ عَنِ الرُّوحِ قُلِ الرُّوحُ مِنْ أَمْرِ رَبِّي وَمَا أُوتِيتُم مِّنَ الْعِلْمِ إِلَّا قَلِيلًا

And they ask you, [O Muḥammad], about the soul. Say, "The soul is of the affair of my Lord. And mankind have not been given of knowledge except a little."

Of course, we do not say nor do we believe that the Prophet ﷺ understands the intricacies and hidden meanings of the Qur'ān as Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ does; however, there is no doubt that he understands the Qur'ān much better than anyone else. Anyone who ponders over the Qur'ān will find other verses too with the same subject matter.

Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا is dependent on the Prophet ﷺ in understanding the Qur'ān

In any case, whether Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا being dependant on the Prophet ﷺ in understanding the Qur'ān is directly established from the Qur'ān or not, the Ahl al-Sunnah undoubtedly believe this to be the case. No textual or logical proof can or has been presented in opposition to this. And how can it? Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا being dependent on the Prophet ﷺ in the understanding of the Qur'ān is clearer than daylight. It needs no proof.

Based on this, is it possible for her to have made a mistake in understanding a particular verse either due to not having heard its explanation from the Prophet

---

1 Sūrah al-Isrā: 85.

صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ or due to not having understood its finer details? This is not impossible by any stretch of the imagination.

Taking this into consideration, if Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهُ or even any present-day scholar understands some finer detail of the Qur'ān—based on Prophetic instruction—which Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهَا did not understand then what harm is it? This would not lower the status of Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهَا, and neither would it warrant others being superior to her.

If understanding one particle of knowledge that another does not, results in the former being superior to the latter, then Khiḍr would have been superior to Mūsā عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ. Though Khiḍr damaged the vessel and killed the boy by the command of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ, Mūsā عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ did not understand its wisdom whilst Khiḍr did. Now as the scholars know, the correct view is that Khiḍr was not a Prophet and even if he was, then by the consensus of the Ummah, Mūsā عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ is superior in rank to Khiḍr عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ.

The incident of Dāwūd عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ making a mistake in the case of the farmer and Sulaymān عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ understanding its correct judgment is well known and mentioned in the Qur'ān. At the time of this incident Sulaymān عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ was not yet a Prophet whilst Dāwūd عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ was, and at that one of the great Prophets. Further, Sulaymān عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ was of a tender age since at the passing of Dāwūd عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ he was only twelve and this incident occurred sometime before that. Thus, if there is a possibility of Dāwūd عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ, one of the great Prophets and the Prophet of the time, making a mistake and a young boy understanding it correctly, then in a similar manner, is it not plausible that Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهَا did not understand an indication in the meaning of the verse, *Yūsīkum Allāh* (Allah instructs you all), which could only have been explained by the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and yet Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهُ did after having understood it from the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ?

Gleaning from this, it is possible that Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهَا was not even aware of the Fadak Estate being fay', as information of this sort is generally known to the warriors and those receiving the booty. Over and above this, the lands of fay' not being under ownership is understood after pondering deeply on the verse, *Mā Afā' Allāh* (what Allah restored). Because of not being aware of these finer details, she sought her inheritance from Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهُ after the passing of the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. According to her estimation, before being aware of the finer details, she

assumed the Prophet ﷺ would fall under the general ruling of the verse of inheritance.

Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها not speaking to Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه explained

There are two possible reasons for this.

The first explanation

When Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه narrated the ḥadīth of the Prophet ﷺ, Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها was filled with remorse and grief. This is because when the Prophets and the devoutly pious do anything slightly out of *their* norm and are alerted to it, they become remorseful. Adam's عليه السلام regret after consuming the wheat, Nūḥ's عليه السلام remorse after praying for the deliverance of his son, and Mūsā's عليه السلام shame after accidentally killing the Qibṭī are all mentioned in the Qur'ān.

Due to this remorse her relationship with Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه changed and their previous order of interacting no longer remained. This change though was not defined by a deliberate avoidance of talking and greeting, as such behaviour for more than three days is impermissible—thus extending it for the rest of their life was unthinkable. In any case, the Ahl al-Sunnah do not criticize Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها for the discontinuation of speaking as mentioned in some narrations.

The second explanation

Another possible explanation for the narration that mentions her not talking is that after having heard the ḥadīth:

لا نورث ما تركنا صدقة

We [the prophets] do not inherit, what we leave behind is ṣadaqah.

Is that she never again raised this issue with him. And why would she? Then there would be no difference between Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها and those who hanker after paltry material gains. Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه on the other hand assumed she might have been upset with him and due to the deep seeded love he had for her, he sought ʿAlī رضي الله عنه to implore her on his behalf and she expressed her happiness. This assumption of Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه is the same assumption that the people carried with them, thinking Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها was angry with Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه.

Was Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها angry with Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه?

If anyone finds themselves feeling uneasy that in some narrations, there is clear mention of Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها being angry with Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه then they may heed the following answer. In the authentic narrations such as those of *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* and *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, the wording that appears is *fa wajadat Fāṭimah*. The word *wajadat* carries the meaning of *ghaḍibat* (anger) and also the meaning of *Ḥazinat* (sadness). One may refer to the lexicons and see for themselves. Since this is the case, what is the need to take it in the meaning of anger and stamp the seal of resentment upon Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها?

Discussing the preposition of Wajadat

If someone says that sure, we agree that the word *wajadat* is used in both these meanings. But if followed by the preposition *ʿalā* (upon), then it will give the sole meaning of anger and if followed by the preposition *ba* then there will be leeway to consider it in the meaning of sadness; but in our case *wajadat* is followed by *ʿAlā*.[1]

The answer to this is that every person understands the next person's speech according to his own intellect. This is why *Riwāyah bi al-Maʿnā* (Transmission of ḥadīth by meaning) off all and sundry are not accepted and when accepted is not at the same level of *Riwāyah bi al-Lafẓ* (Transmission of ḥadīth by exact wording), as it is possible that the reality of the matter is something whilst the narrator understood something else.

This is exactly what happened between Mūsā عليه السلام and Khiḍr عليه السلام and pondering over one's daily dealings, no doubt proves that instances of this nature occur more often than not. It is therefore possible that the narrator said *fa wajadat Fāṭimah* and the one listening thought Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها was not speaking due to her being angry instead of her being sad and remorseful. And when narrating, based on his understanding, the narrator added *ʿalā Abī Bakr* (upon Abū Bakr). In any case, as long as there remains the possibility of a credible interpretation, those of intellect should not think ill of the devoutly pious.

---

1 *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, Ḥadīth: 1759.

Searching for credible interpretation of the pious and entertaining good thoughts regarding them

Allah سُبۡحَانَهُۥ وَتَعَالَىٰ mentions the incident of Mūsā عَلَيۡهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ and Khiḍr عَلَيۡهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ in the Qur'ān and the acts of Khiḍr, viz. damaging the vessel of those who had taken them aboard and killing the young boy. The objections of Mūsā عَلَيۡهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ to the perpetration of these acts has also been reproduced in the Qur'ān. One of the insights gleaned from mentioning this, is to understand the manner in which one should react to such acts of the devoutly pious that apparently seem to be contrary to logic or the Sharīʿah. The lesson learned is for one to attribute ill understanding to one's own myopia instead of painting them in a negative light.

The premise of the following saying is the same:

ظنوا المؤمنين خيرا

Think good of the believers.

The intended audience of this saying are those who see complete believers do something which is apparently against the dictates of the Sharīʿah. Yes, one should advise them in a suitable manner in case they have erred; however, the heart should remain free from any negative thoughts. There are verses of the Qur'ān and authentic aḥādīth which discourage and prohibit suspicion [which in turn would mean entertaining good thoughts]. Such instructions only carry their meaning when directed against those who are involved in an act which apparently goes against the dictates of the Sharīʿah. Otherwise what would the point be? In a similar fashion, the incident that occurred between Abū Bakr and Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنۡهَا will be looked at in a positive light, searching for credible interpretation. An exercise worthy of their stature.

If anyone does not agree, then they should first prove our premise wrong. Merely stating a disagreement is not enough of a counter argument. Let them destroy their hereafter in attempting such foolishness.

Assuming Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنۡهَا was displeased with Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنۡهُ

Assuming Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنۡهَا was displeased with Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنۡهُ over this matter does not make him responsible for it in a manner that seeks to put a blight on his

personality. If anything is established by this, it is that Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها was mistaken in directing her anger at Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه.

Notwithstanding the fact that the Prophets are infallible, they too have had such misunderstandings between them. Why would the pious then be immune? Hārūn's عليه السلام innocence, in the matter of the calf worship that the Banī Isrā'īl were embroiled in, is proven from the Qur'ān. Nevertheless, the incident of Mūsā عليه السلام becoming angry with his brother, to the extent of the altercation becoming physical, is also mentioned in the Qur'ān. Forget Mūsā عليه السلام being taken to task in this matter, he will in fact be rewarded for his anger; a display of his deep-seeded love for monotheism and worry for the commands of Allah سبحانه وتعالى.

Well, in a similar manner understand the issue that occurred between Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها—the Queen of all women—and Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq رضي الله عنه. Both of them are beyond reproach in the matter; in fact, consider them to be rewarded for their actions. For a better understanding of this, turn some pages back and read our dissertation on the verse, *Muḥammad is the Messenger of Allah.*

If Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه made a mistake, the Shīʿah say he repented—discussing the narration of Miṣbaḥ al-Sālikīn

On the other hand, if we assume for a moment, as the Shīʿah do, that Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه had made a mistake then he had repented and the one who repents has his mistake effaced. The following narration is famous:

التائب من الذنب كمن لا ذنب له

The one who repents from sin is like one who did not sin.[1]

If someone wants proof that he had repented, then let us provide such proof that even the Shīʿah will tire themselves nodding their head in agreement. Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī states in *Minhāj al-Kirāmah:*

لما وعظت فاطمة أبا بكر في فَدَك، كتب لها كتاباً بها، وردها عليها

> When Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها spoke to Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه regarding Fadak, he wrote out a document giving it over to her.

1 *Sunan Ibn Mājah*, Ḥadīth: 4250.

This narration has been recounted a few times now and as the couplet goes:

هو المسك ما كررته يتضوع

The more you apply musk, the more the fragrance.

I look for opportunities to recount this narration; a karāmāt of Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها. The Shīʿah themselves have adequately answered the accusation they have made with this narration. By this narration, the Shīʿah have expunged their own allegations be it against Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها or Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه. This narration has totalled their claims of Fadak being her ownership by way inheritance, a gift, a bequest, or any other avenue. This is a manifestation of the verse:

وَكَفَى اللّٰهُ الْمُؤْمِنِيْنَ الْقِتَالَ

And sufficient was Allah for the believers in battle.[1]

If for arguments sake, we assume that this narration is not to be found in a book reliable to the Shīʿah, then there is another that proves Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه to be innocent. The following narration, which I have been promising to reproduce for some time, appears in the book *Miṣbaḥ al-Sālikīn*—a book reliable to the Shīʿah—and other books of the Shīʿah:

> أن أبا بكر لما رأى أن فاطمة انقبضت عنه وهجرته ، ولم تتكلم بعد ذلك في أمر فدك ، كبر ذلك عنده ، فأراد استرضاءها فأتاها فقال لها : صدقت يا ابنة رسول الله فيما ادعيت ، ولكني رأيت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يقسمها ، فيعطي الفقراء والمساكين وابن السبيل بعد أن يؤتي منها قوتكم والصانعين بها ، فقالت : افعل فيها كما كان أبي رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يفعل فيها ، فقال : ولك الله على أن أفعل فيها ما كان يفعل أبوك ، فقالت : والله لتفعلن ؟ فقال : والله لأفعلن ذلك ، فقال : اللهم اشهد ، فرضيت ذلك ، وأخذت العهد ، وكان أبو بكر بعطيهم منها قوتهم ويقسم الباقي فيعطي الفقراء والمساكين وابن السبيل
>
> When Abū Bakr noticed Fāṭimah had withdrawn from him and did not speak to him regarding the Fadak Estate again, it pained him. Intending to appease

1 Sūrah al-Aḥzāb: 25.

> her he came to her and said, "O daughter of the Prophet, you are true in what you claim; however, I saw the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ distributing it; giving it to the poor, needy, and travelers after your provisions and the revenue workers' earnings had been taken out."
>
> She said, "Continue doing as my father the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ had done with it."
>
> He said, "I take an oath for you from Allah, to do as your father had done, I will do so."
>
> She asked, "By Allah, will you do so?"
>
> He said, "By Allah, I will do so. O Allah, be my witness."
>
> She was pleased by this and took his oath. Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ would give them their provisions from it and distribute the rest amongst the poor, needy, and travelers.

This narration holds a few key pieces of information. Firstly, Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ did not belie Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا in that it was gifted to her. However, since a gift is incomplete until ownership is transferred—according to both the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Shīʿah—he excused himself from handing it over. Therefore, even if for arguments sake, the narration of it being gifted was authentic, the Shīʿah complaint of Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ belying Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا is moot. ʿAmmār ʿAlī has blackened his name by arguing this in his letter to Mīr ʿAlī. Secondly, Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ did not personally gain even a grain from the Fadak Estate, distributing to the poor anything left after providing the needs of Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا.

Thus, it becomes quite clear. There was no material motive in not giving over the Fadak Estate. He had definitely heard something from the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ due to which he held it back. The result of these two issues coming to the fore is clarity on the narration of Umm Ayman and ʿAlī رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا. It is no doubt a fabrication of the Shīʿah. This is because the need for witnesses is only in the event of the possibility of the plaintiff lying.

And if there still remains any doubt of an ulterior motive inspired by not wanting to be hanged by public opinion then, firstly, there is no medication for obsessive doubts built on thin air and, secondly, why are the Shīʿah making it an issue when Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا herself was pleased at how the situation worked out?

A third piece of key information we gain from this narration is that right till the passing of the Prophet ﷺ, the Fadak Estate remained within his supervision and administration. Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها had no oversight or managerial duties of the Estate. Otherwise she would not have responded to his assertion of what the Prophet ﷺ used to do by instructing him to carry on in the same manner. Rather she would have established her ownership and done as she pleased. Possession of the Estate would have been common knowledge and a multitude of people would have supported her claim.

Fourthly, Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه sincerely wanted Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها to have the Fadak Estate. Furthermore, he had no ill feelings towards her, otherwise her being upset would not have troubled him in the least and he wouldn't have made the effort to please her. This premise has already been established under our discussion of the verse, *Muḥammad is the Messenger of Allah*; one seeking another's pleasure is a product of love. If someone were to say that his acts were motivated by public opinion, then this is refuted by the wording of the narration "... it pained him. Intending to appease her he came to her". This portrays his anguish and his worry to please her.

Moreover, if he was worried of being labeled dishonorable, this would have been from the camp that disagreed with him, not from those who concurred with his decision, since the latter knew that Fadak was not in the ownership of the Prophet ﷺ and that there is no inheritance in the Prophets effects. As he didn't want any of it for himself, he would have given it over to Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها, thus silencing any critics. Only the feeble-minded Shīʿah can mount such weak attacks that hold no weight. This narration is a display of his truthfulness and trustworthiness, provided the one reading is cognitively available. What was the need for him to feel troubled since he had complete autonomy to do as he pleased? This anguish of his was a result of his wish to please Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها. Taking into consideration him not keeping Fadak for himself, nor giving it to Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها despite the deep love he had for her and the fact that it would have silenced his critics leaves only one logical explanation: His decision was based upon adhering to the law of Allah سبحانه وتعالى, following the command of the Prophet ﷺ, and taking into consideration the best interest of the faith and the state.

Adhering to the law of Allah سبحانه وتعالى was by understanding and imbibing within his decision the indications of both the verses *Yūsīkum Allāh* (Allah instructs you all) and

Mā Afā' Allāh (what Allah restored). Following the command of the Prophet ﷺ was by following the command of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ and by following the instruction found in the narration, "We [the prophets] do not inherit, what we leave behind is ṣadaqah." The Shīʿah narrations from the books they deem reliable concur and give strength to these two observances. As for considering the best interests, firstly, the laws of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ and the commands of the Prophet ﷺ brim with expediency. Secondly, if Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ had given over the Fadak Estate to Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا—based on the assumption of the narration of gifting being authentic—without the divine prerequisites regarding witnesses being fulfilled, in as far as the claim being supported by Umm Ayman, ʿAlī, and even Ḥasan and Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ, it would have resulted in the establishment of discriminatory law practices based on societal status and a precedent of preferential treatment in Islamic canon till the end of time.

Additionally, since the Fadak Estate remained with the Prophet ﷺ until his last, the gifting was not complete as ownership was not transferred—according to both the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Shīʿah. Therefore, based on the narration "We [the prophets] do not inherit, what we leave behind is ṣadaqah", it had become ṣadaqah. If Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ had given it to her then [Allah forbid] the Prophet ﷺ would have come under the ambit of the ḥadīth:

العائد في صدقته كالكلب يعود في قيئه

One who gets back the charity is like a dog who swallows its vomit.[1]

If the Shīʿah then claim it was not gifted but it was inherited, then just as Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ could not give it to her in the assumption of it being gifted, similarly it was not possible for him to give it to her assuming it was inheritance. Since the narration "We [the prophets] do not inherit, what we leave behind is ṣadaqah", is authentic, we learn that on the passing of the Prophet ﷺ all his effects had become ṣadaqah. And if an item is not within the ownership of the deceased, it cannot be inherited. How could Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ then embroil himself in such naivety? This would result in the Prophet ﷺ being subjected to the ḥadīth mentioned above and that inheritance has been affected in an item that was not under ownership—resulting in *Ijtimāʿ al-Naqīḍayn* [the coming together of two contradictories].

---

1 *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, Ḥadīth: 1620.

Furthermore, from the narration, "We [the prophets] do not inherit, what we leave behind is ṣadaqah", we learn that the pleasure of the Prophet ﷺ lied in none of his effects being inherited and the pleasure of Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها was in opposition to this. Stuck between the two Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه gave precedence to the wish of the Prophet ﷺ and acted accordingly. He then made efforts to reconcile with Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها and please her as explicitly mentioned in the narration above. This shows his complete adherence to the wish of the Prophet ﷺ and his ability to mend the relationship with Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها. He went beyond the call of duty as he was not under obligation to please Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها in fulfilling the wish of the Prophet ﷺ. Besides, if he had given anything over to Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها, ʿAbbās رضي الله عنه, and the Noble Consorts of the Prophet ﷺ would have also asked for their share rendering the ḥadīth pointless and the khilāfah feeble.

The fifth key point of note from the narration of *Miṣbaḥ al-Sālikīn* is that even though Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها was displeased at some point, Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه presented a valid excuse to her and she became pleased with him. It is quite evident that when the displeasure no longer existed and her being happy with him is explicitly mentioned, dredging up the issue of her displeasure makes no sense. All praise belongs to Allah, the issue of Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها being pleased with Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه has been proven from the narrations of the Shīʿah themselves, that too from a book they consider reliable. Over and above that, the narration appears in other books of theirs as well besides it being recorded in *Miṣbaḥ al-Sālikīn*.

Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها is pleased according to the narrations of the Ahl al-Sunnah

The displeasure of Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها, the agony of Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه, and his seeking the intercession of ʿAlī رضي الله عنه in this regard which resulted in her becoming happy with him has been mentioned in the narrations of the Ahl al-Sunnah as well. *Madārij al-Nubuwwah*, *Kitāb al-Wafā'*, *al-Bayhaqī*, and *Shurūḥ al-Mishkāt* have recorded such narrations. Shaykh ʿAbd al-Haqq has recorded in *Shurūḥ al-Mishkāt* Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه going to her home after the incident and standing in the sun at her door presenting his explanation, upon which Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها became happy with him. This incident has been mentioned at length in *al-Riyāḍ al-Naḍirah* as well as in *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* by way of al-Bayhaqī on the authority of Shaʿbī.

Ibn al-Sammān has recorded in his book *al-Muwāfaqah Bayn Ahl al-Bayt wa al-Ṣaḥābah* on the authority of al-Awzāʿī that Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ went to the door of Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا on a hot day and said, "I will not move from here till the daughter of the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ is pleased with me." ʿAlī رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ then went inside and took an oath from Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا to be pleased with him which she acquiesced to. From this we can gleam that the Zaydī Shīʿah narrations are also in conformity to the narrations of the Ahl al-Sunnah.

An impartial consideration of these narrations will lead one to conclude that Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ had absolutely no ill-feelings towards the family of the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. Rather, he was fond of them and revered them to the extent of deeming himself their servant even whilst in the seat of khilāfah. The character of Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ shows his elevated status, complete truthfulness, and clean heart. If he was hankering after material gain, he would have not gone to such lengths to appease Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا nor would she have felt confident in displaying her feelings to him if he was a tyrant ruler.

Barring Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ from attending her burial

Taking the above discussions into account, there remains no doubt that if for arguments sake we assume for a moment that she made a bequest for Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ to stay away from her burial, it was due to her extreme modesty. Because she knew Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ held her in high esteem, he would definitely be present for her burial and so she singled him out. She was aware that he would not let the opportunity of showing solidarity with the Ahl al-Bayt go by under any circumstance and so, as a testament to her modesty, had no other option but to make such a bequest. This was further necessitated as he was the khalīfah, the one responsible for the congregational and funeral prayers.

Her bequest was general

Her bequest was general, barring all non-maḥram men, which is why she made a bequest to be buried at night due to her modesty. Her high level of modesty in this matter is proven from authentic narrations in which Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا expressed her discomfort of her shrouded body being transported in front of strange men. The practice in that era was to transport the body of the deceased without a closed casket. Hearing this, Asmā' bint ʿUmays رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا [the wife of Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ]

mentioned to her the practice of the Abyssinians of using a covered canopied structure made of date palm branches in which they would transport the deceased. Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها requested one be made and showed to her, which Asmā’ رضي الله عنها did. Upon inspecting it, Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها was elated and smiled; something she hadn’t done since the passing of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم.

Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها then made a bequest to Asmā’ رضي الله عنها that she be the one to wash her body with ʿAlī رضي الله عنه being present not allowing any other person to be there. Consider now, how could Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه have been present at her ghusl? In fact, there was no way for anyone else to have been present, neither men, nor women. If she had so much modesty that she would not allow any other women to be present, then it is entirely plausible for to request no men be at her funeral. Owing to this, ʿAlī رضي الله عنه buried her at night without informing anyone.

To recap, she requested no man be present at her funeral without singling out Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه. There is no single narration of the Ahl al-Sunnah that alludes to her having barred Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه exclusively. Such false additions to the narrations are a result of the evil ploys of the Shīʿah. Over and above that they have the gall to reference such fabrications to the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah! ʿAmmār ʿAlī has traversed all boundaries of shame and academic honesty by referencing such a fabrication to *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*. He states that narration of her making a bequest to bar Abū Bakr and ʿUmar رضي الله عنهما from her funeral is in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*. Only Allah knows where such immodesty stems from! Does he not have any shame in making claims that are clear cut lies? *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* isn’t a rare book. There are thousands of copies available. Nowhere is this fabrication found. Hereunder is the narration under discussion:

فلما توفيت دفنها زوجها علي بن أبي طالب ليلا، ولم يؤذن بها أبا بكر، وصلى عليها علي

> When she died, her husband. ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib, buried her at night. He did not inform Abu Bakr about her death and offered the funeral prayer over her himself.[1]

There is no mention of such a bequest for or after this in the narration. I am lost as to how ʿAmmār ʿAlī came to the conclusion of her bequest barring Abū Bakr and

1 *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, Ḥadīth: 1759.

ʿUmar رضي الله عنهما from her funeral based on this. Subḥān Allāh! This is the honesty and trust of the Shīʿah scholars.

In any case, the extent of what has been mentioned in the narration of *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* is that ʿAlī رضي الله عنه buried Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها at night, did not inform Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه of her passing, and performed her funeral prayer himself. There is another view which states that ʿAbbās رضي الله عنه and a few of the Ahl al-Bayt performed her funeral prayer and buried her at night. However, the narration of *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* is only to the extent mentioned, there is no indication to the 'supposed' bequest.

If for arguments sake we assume there was any bequest of this sort, it would have been to bar **all** men from attending her funeral. In some narrations there is mention of Abū Bakr, ʿUmar, and the other Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم going to ʿAlī رضي الله عنه the next day to console him. In this narration there is also mention of them complaining to him for not alerting them to her funeral because of which they missed the opportunity of being present for her funeral procession and prayer. ʿAlī رضي الله عنه responded to them citing the wishes of Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها to be buried at night so that no strange men will see my funeral procession. He stated his actions was in conformity to her wishes. These narrations clearly relay her wish that no strange men be present at her funeral. There was no exclusivity of Abū Bakr and ʿUmar رضي الله عنهما.

The obsessive suspicious predisposition of the Shīʿah is such that no matter the logical or textual proof in front of them, they will always attribute any action or lack thereof of the Ahl al-Bayt to their hate of Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه. Their character has been summed up in the following poem:

> *When a dog is hit with a stone on its head,*
>
> *he wags its tail, maybe it's a bone; his daily bread.*
>
> *And when it sees a dead body being carried by two,*
>
> *he misconstrues it his lunch, to chew.*

To conclude, there is no mention of Abū Bakr or ʿUmar رضي الله عنهما exclusively being barred.

Her funeral prayer was performed by Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه

According to the narration of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* the complete opposite is established. The narration states, Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها passed away between Maghrib and ʿIshā on the

Tuesday the 3rd of Ramaḍān six months after the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم, at the age of 28. Abū Bakr, ʿUthmān, and ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn ʿAwf رضي الله عنهم were present at the time of ʿIshā and at the wish of ʿAlī رضي الله عنه, Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه performed the prayer with four extra *takbīr*. This narration and the attitude of ʿAlī رضي الله عنه clearly rejects any notion of Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها making a bequest to bar Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه from her funeral. ʿAlī's رضي الله عنه bravery was famed and Abū Bakr's رضي الله عنه sublime conduct was well documented. If she had made such a bequest, he would not have shied away from implementing her wish to its fullest extent due to his bravery and there was no need for Taqiyyah in the face of Abū Bakr's رضي الله عنه sublime conduct. Thus, there is no narration that speaks of her wish to bar Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه.

Yes, there are narrations that speaks of the general prevention of people from attending her funeral, and if for arguments sake there was any exclusivity for Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه then the reasons for such have already been detailed. Based on the assumption that such a narration exists that prevents ʿUmar رضي الله عنه as well, then the reasons for her wish to bar him can be explained by the following. ʿUmar رضي الله عنه enjoyed the status of being privy to the decisions of Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه and his opinion was highly regarded; he was as a vizier is to a king. Thus, if we assume such a narration exists that specifically bars Abū Bakr and ʿUmar رضي الله عنهما, it was due to the close relationship they had in the decision-making process [including that of Fadak] and in being with each other most of the time; it would not have been possible to prevent one without the other. Such a bequest would not have been based on any ill feelings or hatred towards Abū Bakr and ʿUmar رضي الله عنهما.

The logical proof of the premise that Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها wished to prevent Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه from attending her funeral was due to her extreme modesty and not due to ill-feelings is as follows. If it was based on hatred and ill-feelings, it would have been to prevent Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه to perform her funeral prayer; who was the khalīfah and the one responsible for performing the five daily ṣalāh and the funeral ṣalāh. This does not make sense in any way because according to the consensus of historians, both of the Ahl al-Sunnah and Shīʿah, at the funeral of Ḥasan رضي الله عنه, his brother Ḥusayn رضي الله عنه indicated to Saʿīd ibn al-ʿĀṣ رضي الله عنه [Muʿāwiyah's رضي الله عنه representative] to perform the prayer citing the Amīr leading the funeral prayer is the sunnah of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم and had it not been so he would have not allowed him to lead the prayer. If Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها had made the bequest to prevent Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه from performing her funeral prayer, Ḥusayn رضي الله عنه would have definitely prevented

Saʿīd ibn al-ʿĀṣ رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ from performing Ḥasan's رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ funeral prayer. This is besides the fact that Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ held a much higher status in comparison to Saʿīd ibn al-ʿĀṣ رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ and in particular in the aspect of leading the prayer. His superiority in leading the prayer is evident from his appointment by the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ to lead the Muhājirīn and the Anṣār some six months prior to Fāṭimah's رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا passing.

To conclude, all evidences, textual and logical, prove that the supposition of the Shīʿah that Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا could not tolerate Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ at her funeral is as a result of their nescience. And if we put aside all logical and textual evidences, the narration of *Miṣbaḥ al-Sālikīn* is sufficient to demonstrate our point. The said narration clearly shows that even if Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا had any ill-feelings towards Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ, these feelings were resolved and they were both happy with each other.

If any Shīʿah goes a step further and presumes Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ to be a hypocrite and her display of pleasure a mere front, then this is them projecting their own views. A presumption only they can make heads or tails of.

Nobody's displeasure matters when Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ and the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ are pleased.

If for arguments sake, we consider the Shīʿah stance that Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا left this world unhappy with Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ, it doesn't matter since Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ and the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ were pleased with him. Whatever ill-feelings remained is taken care off by Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ says describing the manner in which the pious will enter paradise:

وَنَزَعْنَا مَا فِيْ صُدُوْرِهِم مِّنْ غِلٍّ إِخْوَانًا عَلَىٰ سُرُرٍ مُّتَقَابِلِيْنَ

And We will remove whatever is in their breasts of resentment, [so they will be] brothers, on thrones facing each other.[1]

From this verse we learn that ill-feelings do develop between the pious; however, such ill-feelings do not harm them in the least. As they enter Paradise, Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ will remove any such feelings and any negativity between them will dissipate due to them being residents of Paradise. Thus, if we assume as the Shīʿah, do that Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا left this world displeased with Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ, then this verse serves

1 Sūrah al-Ḥijr: 47.

as a glad tiding to Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه and his well-wishers and leaves the eyes of the Shīʿah grating with grit.

Perhaps some hopeless Shīʿah objects to this, stating anyone Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها is unhappy with does not fall under the ambit of this verse due to the following narration which both the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Shīʿah accept:

الا ان فاطمة بضعة مني يؤذيني ما آذاها يريبني ما رابها فمن اغضبها اغضبني

> Know well, Fāṭimah is a part of me, whatever harms her, harms me, and whatever bothers her, bothers me. Whoever angers her angers me.[1]

The answer to this is that the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم had already given consideration to Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه in this ḥadīth. See, the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم said:

فمن اغضبها اغضبني

Whoever angers her, angers me.

He did not say:

من غضبتْ غليه غضبتُ عليه

Whoever she gets angry with, I will be angry with.

There is no doubt that anyone who angers her would have done so intentionally by their actions or speech and it is foolish for anyone to think Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه angered her intentionally. In any case, those who were aware of this entire discussion know and those who were not are now in the know.

Looking at the narrations, one finds Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه addressing Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها on many occasions saying:

---

1 The wording of *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, Ḥadīth: 2449, is:

فإنما ابنتي بضعة مني، يريبني ما رابها ويؤذيني ما آذاها

For my daughter is part of me. He who disturbs her in fact disturbs me and he who offends her offends me.

The wording of *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, Ḥadīth: 3714, is:

فاطمة بضعة مني، فمن أغضبها أغضبني

Fatima is a part of me, and whoever angers her, angers me.

والذي نفسي بيده، لقرابة رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم أحب إلي أن أصل من قرابتي

By the One in Whose hand is my soul, serving the relatives of the Prophet ﷺ are dearer to me than serving my own relatives.[1]

Since he did not intentionally anger her, in fact always trying to please her, how could he then fall under the warning featured in the above ḥadīth. If there really was any sort of anger, it emanated from Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها based on natural predisposition. And if we overlook the details and explanations of such a supposition, it would mean the promise of the verse under discussion will apply to her and any resentment will be removed from the heart of Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها.

ʿAlī رضي الله عنه angering Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها on numerous occasions

If we assume that her mere anger is sufficient for one to fall under the warning of the ḥadīth then the Shīʿah have their work cut out for them. We do not claim Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه to be infallible. It is possible for him to have done an act due to which he falls under some warning. However, the Shīʿah believe ʿAlī رضي الله عنه to be infallible. What do they say then about Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها becoming angry with ʿAlī رضي الله عنه on numerous occasions regarding their household matters? In fact, if we look at the background to the narration, "Fāṭimah is a part of me…", we find a disagreement between ʿAlī and Fāṭimah رضي الله عنهما led to the Prophet ﷺ making this statement. The gist of the incident as mentioned in the narrations is that ʿAlī رضي الله عنه sent a proposal to the daughter of Abū Jahal upon which Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها went to the Prophet ﷺ crying. Having heard what had transpired the Prophet ﷺ said, "… Fāṭimah is a part of me…" Thus, if by merely angering Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها, Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه came under the warning mentioned in the ḥadīth, then ʿAlī رضي الله عنه would also be under the same warning. This is because, firstly, the statement made by the Prophet ﷺ was in reference to him and, secondly, Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه was excused from giving Fadak due to divine law, [though he wished it remained by her if it wasn't against the command of Allah سبحانه وتعالى as understood from the narration of *Miṣbaḥ al-Sālikīn*] whilst ʿAlī رضي الله عنه wasn't forced to marry the daughter of Abū Jahal.

1 *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*: 3712.

Similarly, on one occasion ʿAlī رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهُ left the house upset, and fell asleep in the masjid on the bare ground with no pillow or covering. When the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ came to know of this he went to Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهَا and asked her of the whereabouts of ʿAlī رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهُ. Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهَا responded saying he had an argument with her and left the house, not coming home for the afternoon siesta either.

Both these incidents have been narrated in books of the Ahl al-Sunnah and the books of the Shīʿah.

Sending a proposal was no sin and anger was a human reaction

Besides the point already extrapolated from the first incident, another issue comes to fore as well. Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهَا was human after all and she would become angry which is a natural human emotion. ʿAlī رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهُ was not committing a sin by intending to marry the daughter of Abū Jahal, it was in conformity to the commands of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ and the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. Her becoming angry at his intent was as a result of human emotion. In fact, the common factor in both incidents is that even an 'infallible' can become angry as a result of them being human. Because both ʿAlī and Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهُمَا were 'infallible', neither of them can be taken to task for their arguments and anger. All that can be said is due to human predisposition one had a misgiving about the other which resulted in them inadvertently becoming angry and losing consideration of the others 'infallibility'.

In a similar manner, it is not far-fetched to accept Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهَا became angry with Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهُ as a result of her humanness. Nevertheless, what becomes abundantly clear is that if one did not intend to anger Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهَا, they will not fall under the warning mentioned in the ḥadīth. Besides, it is well noted that Mūsā عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ became angry with his elder brother Hārūn عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ; a Prophet in his own right, to the extent that he physically assaulted him by grabbing him by his hair and beard. It is also common knowledge that Hārūn عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ did not intend to anger Mūsā عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ since intentionally angering a Prophet is disbelief. Then too Mūsā عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ evidently became angry.

From this we learn that if due to human nature one *becomes* angry with another, it is not considered *making* another angry. This is exactly the essence of the incident between Abū Bakr and Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهُمَا. He did not anger her; if anything, she *became* angry. Conversely, one may tentatively undertake the assumption that if anyone

made her angry, it might have been ʿAlī رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ as he was her husband and would not have had the same amount of reverence for her that Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ had. ʿAlī رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ angering her is also supported by the context of the narration, "... Whoever angers her...".

Hence, since Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ did not make her angry, to deem him under the warning of the ḥadīth will land the one with this assumption under the warning of the ḥadīth himself.

One adopting problematic and illegitimate beliefs will no doubt displease Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا and the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. Further, it will displease the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ double-fold. Due to his own displeasure and due to displeasing Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا. This, without a shadow of doubt, is *making* her angry and not her *becoming* angry due to human nature. It can therefore be unquestionably established that one who vilifies Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ falls under the warning of "...Whoever angers her...". Those who adopted these illegitimate beliefs and died while having vilified Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ are gone. However, Molvī ʿAmmār ʿAlī and the rest of the Shīʿah should worry about themselves and remove themselves from these erroneous beliefs. They should turn to Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ seeking His forgiveness in a bid to make up for their transgressions. If they don't listen, that's their problem.

It is time to conclude now, as there is nothing left of ʿAmmār ʿAlī's foolishness that hasn't been sufficiently answered in this book, through the grace of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ. Hence, I conclude with the following words:

الحمد لله رب العلمين والصلوة والسلام على سيّد المرسلين وعلى آله واصحابه وازواجه واهل بيته وذريته اجمعين – والمرجو منك يا ارحم الراحمين ان تتقبل هذه الرسالة مني وتجعله وسيلة لي الى رضائك ورضاء رسولك صلى الله عليه وسلم ورضاء اهل بيته ورضاء صاحبه في الغار سيّدنا ابي بكر الصديق رضي الله عنه ومن سواه من اصحابه صلى الله عليه وسلم رضوان الله عليهم اجمعين وان تغفرلي وترحمني بهذه الاوراق في الدنيا والآخرة مغفرة ورحمة تحيط بها والدي وآبائى الماضين وذريتي واقاربي واحبابي خصوصاً من امرني بالقيام لهذا الامر العظيم برحمتك يا ارحم الراحمين

All praise is for Allah, the Lord of the worlds. Peace and salutations be upon the Master of the Messengers and upon his family, his noble consorts, and children. My hope from You, O Most Merciful of those who have mercy, is to accept from me this book and make it a means to attain Your pleasure, the pleasure of Your Messenger ﷺ, the pleasure of his family, the pleasure of his Companion in the cave Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهُ, and the rest of his Companions رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهُمْ. My hope from you, by the means of these pages, is to enshroud me, my forefathers, my children, my dear ones, and especially those who have instructed me to take on this great task with your forgiveness and mercy, O Most Merciful of those who have mercy.

A summary of the answers to the objections of Fadak

Whichever Shīʿah vilifies the first khalīfah due to the Fadak issue will do so by either claiming it to be gifted or inherited. In each case there are three preliminary issues that is necessary for them to establish.

In the case of claiming it to be gifted, the following three preliminary issues have to be established:

1. That the Fadak Estate was in the ownership of the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.
2. That the gifting took place.
3. That possession of the gift was taken.

Similarly, in the case of claiming it to be inherited, the following three preliminary issues have to be established:

1. That the Fadak Estate was in the ownership of the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.
2. That the link of the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ to this world has come to an end, that the connection between his body and soul was broken.
3. That the verse:

   يُوصِيكُمُ اللّٰهُ فِيْ أَوْلَادِكُمْ لِلذَّكَرِ مِثْلُ حَظِّ الْأُنْثَيَيْنِ

   Allah instructs you all concerning your children: for the male, what is equal to the share of two females.[1]

   Includes in its purport the Prophet صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ in the same manner as it does the rest of the Ummah.

Those cognizant of the sciences of argumentation and deliberation (*Munaẓarah*) will be aware that the Ahl al-Sunnah are defendants in this case and as such aren't obliged to consider any evidence. Merely rejecting the argument is sufficient. Furthermore, rejecting any one of the preliminary issues in either cases is sufficient to render them and Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهُ safe from any reproach forget rejecting all three. And if they refute all three preliminary issues through clear proofs or establish its opposite by way of robust evidences then their view cannot be challenged.

---

1 Sūrah al-Nisā': 11.

Those that have studied this book, *Hadiyyat al-Shīʿah*, will be aware that in the case of gifting the last two preliminary issues were not established by the Shīʿah, rather its opposite was established according to the principles of the Ahl al-Sunnah.

In the case of inheritance, even though refuting the second preliminary issue was difficult, I have addressed it adequately in the book *Āb-e-Ḥayāt* which will be published soon, Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى willing. Any impartial Shīʿah who studies it will begin speaking the truth. As for the people of the truth, the Ahl al-Sunnah, their occupation *is* to recognise the truth as true and falsehood as false.

The first preliminary issue in the case of both gifting and inheriting and the third in the case of inheriting, have been refuted and its opposites established in detail in this book.

The falsehood of the first preliminary issue in both cases is so clear that only a disbeliever with a rotten heart will have any misgivings regarding it. It is for this very reason that when I was working for the Mujtabā'ī publishing house in Meerut [1860-1868] I went to meet the son of Muḥammad Qulī Kuntūrī, Molvī Ḥāmid Ḥusayn—Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṭūsī II and successor of Nūr Allāh Shūstarī—when he stayed at the house of Mīr Mahdī ʿAlī in Meerut while on his way to Ludhiana. I raised a few of these issues with him and the renowned Molvī Ṣāḥib was unable to furnish me with any answer.

And Allah does not guide the wrongdoing people.